BEST COPY
AVAILABLE

United Nations A/52/PV.69

General Assembly
Fifty-second Session

Official Records

69th plenary meeting
Wednesday, 10 December 1997, 3 p.m.
New York

President: Mr. Udovenko . . . . . (Ukraine)

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Statement on the occasion of Human Rights Day

The President: Before turning to the items on our agenda for this afternoon, I would like to recall that today is Human Rights Day; by commemorating this international Human Rights Day, we mark the beginning of the fiftieth anniversary year of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Promotion of human rights has been at the core of United Nations activities since the inception of our Organization. At the very outset the United Nations Charter reaffirmed faith in "fundamental human rights" and in the "dignity and worth of the human person". Adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights only three years after the establishment of the United Nations reflected a common understanding that fundamental freedoms and respect for human dignity provide the most solid foundation for peace, democracy, development and fruitful international cooperation in every field of human activity.

As we look back today at the United Nations work in the field of human rights, we can be proud of what has been accomplished, in particular in standard-setting and human rights advocacy. We cannot pretend, however, that the gap has been bridged between aspirations and achievements. Arbitrary arrests, torture, imprisonment without trial, exploitation of children, denial of equal rights to women, discrimination on the basis of race — these violations of human rights continue to be a sad reality in today's world and to call for our urgent and decisive action.

As we are launching today the year of the fiftieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, let us renew our commitment to the ideals enshrined in this historic document. Let us make sure that 1998 becomes a milestone in the long struggle for the achievement of one of the most noble purposes of the United Nations.

Agenda item 18

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (A/52/23 (Parts I-VII), A/AC.109/2071-2072, 2074-2078, 2080-2082, 2084-2090)

Report of the Secretary-General (A/52/364 and Add. 1)

Draft resolutions (A/52/L.64, A/52/23 (Part II), Chapter III, para. 10)

97-86728 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one month of the date of the meeting*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

The President: I call on the Rapporteur of the Special Committee to introduce the Committee's report and the draft resolution contained in paragraph 10, part II, chapter III of the report.

Mr. Mekdad (Syrian Arab Republic) (Rapporteur of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples): I have the honour to present to the General Assembly for its consideration the report of the Special Committee covering its work during 1997, which is contained in document A/52/23.

The report is submitted in accordance with paragraph 11 of resolution 51/146 on the implementation of the Declaration, by which the Assembly requested the Special Committee to continue to seek suitable means for the immediate and full implementation of the Declaration; to carry out those actions approved by the General Assembly regarding the International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism in all Territories that had not yet exercised their right to self-determination; and, in particular, to formulate specific proposals for the elimination of the remaining manifestations of colonialism.

At its forty-sixth session the General Assembly, by adopting resolution 46/181, entitled "International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism", and the plan of action, mandated the Special Committee to undertake a series of activities during the Decade including organizing during the Decade seminars in the Caribbean and Pacific regions alternately.

During this year the Special Committee was able to discharge the tasks entrusted to it by the Assembly and to submit appropriate recommendations on all the items referred to it for consideration and report, by meeting between January and July and by holding extensive consultations among its members throughout the year.

Bearing in mind in particular the specific requests addressed to it by the General Assembly in resolution 51/146, the Special Committee reviewed the implementation of the Declaration relating to the remaining Territories and formulated a series of recommendations with a view to enhancing the pace of decolonization and to promoting the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the peoples in those Territories.

In addition, the Special Committee submitted recommendations specifically relating to economic and other activities that affect the interests of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories; military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers in Territories under their administration; the implementation of the Declaration by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations; and information transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter. In this connection, I would like to draw the attention of Members to the fact that the text of the draft resolution on economic and other activities is a result of the consultations between the Special Committee of 24 and the European Union, and has been updated in order to fully reflect the realities and a general understanding among Member States concerning decolonization.

During the year, the Special Committee devoted considerable attention to the decolonization of the small island Territories. In that connection, the Special Committee was especially mindful of the fact that the United Nations visiting missions had provided an effective means of assessing and ascertaining the wishes and aspirations of the peoples of those Territories regarding their future status. Accordingly, it once again stressed the importance of dispatching such missions to colonial Territories in order to facilitate the implementation of the Declaration. In that respect, the Committee will continue to seek the full cooperation of the administering Powers so that visiting missions to Territories under their administration can be undertaken.

On the question of publicity to be given to the work of the United Nations in the field of decolonization, and as reflected in chapter III of its report, the Committee again reiterated the importance of effecting the widest possible dissemination of information on decolonization as an instrument for furthering the purposes and principles of the Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and for mobilizing world public opinion in support of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories in their efforts to achieve self-determination, freedom and independence.

Bearing in mind the important role being played by non-governmental organizations in the decolonization process and the dissemination of information on the situation in all the remaining small island Non-Self-Governing Territories, the Special Committee requested the Department of Political Affairs and the Department of Public Information to continue their cooperation with

those organizations in the dissemination of information on decolonization issues.

I have the honour to introduce for adoption by the General Assembly the draft resolution on dissemination of information on decolonization, contained in paragraph 10, chapter III, Part II of document A/52/23.

During the year, in the light of the constructive results achieved and in keeping with related decisions of the Assembly, the Committee decided to continue to maintain close contact with the organizations concerned and to participate in the conferences arranged by those organizations, as well as by other United Nations bodies. The objective of those contacts was to facilitate the effective implementation of the decisions of the various United Nations bodies and to foster cooperation between the specialized agencies and those regional organizations in their assistance to the Non-Self-Governing Territories in those regions.

I should like to draw members' attention to the proposals outlined in section J of chapter I, entitled "Future work", which, the Committee hopes, will meet with the Assembly's approval in order to enable the Committee to proceed with the effective discharge of the task that remains to be completed. It should be noted that, during 1997, the Special Committee undertook important decisions aimed at streamlining its work and increasing its transparency. We have integrated the Subcommittee with the Special Committee. We have also abolished the Working Group, whose functions are now being performed by the Committee's Bureau, which has become open-ended.

The Special Committee recommended that the General Assembly renew its appeal to the administering Powers concerned to take all necessary steps for the implementation of the Declaration and the relevant United Nations resolutions, in accordance with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. In that connection, the Special Committee, bearing in mind the useful results achieved as a consequence of the active participation of the administering Powers, recommended that the Assembly again request the administering Powers to resume formal cooperation or continue to cooperate with the Special Committee in the discharge of its mandate and, in particular, to participate actively in its work relating to the Territories under their respective administration.

The General Assembly may also wish to renew its appeal to all States, the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system to meet various requests addressed to them by the United Nations in its resolutions on the question of decolonization.

The Special Committee devoted considerable time to discussing the question of the decolonization programme in the United Nations system. It is gratifying that the Secretary-General, Mr. Kofi Annan, in his letter addressed to the Chairman of the Special Committee of 24, as contained in document A/52/531, reaffirmed his commitment to the full implementation of subprogramme 1.6 of the medium-term plan for the period 1998-2001. We hope that this commitment of the Secretary-General will be fully implemented, without any delay, and that the stand-alone Decolonization Unit in the Department of Political Affairs will be adequately staffed. This would assist the Special Committee in continuing efficiently to discharge its noble mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly.

On behalf of the Committee, I commend the report to the attention of the General Assembly.

Before concluding, allow me to express to all the members of the Special Committee and, in particular, to Ambassador Utula Utuoc Samana of Papua New Guinea, Chairman of the Special Committee, Ambassador Bruno Rodríguez Parilla of Cuba and Ambassador Moctar Ouane of Mali, Vice-Chairmen, my deep gratitude for their cooperation and support.

I also thank Mr. Amer Araim, the Secretary of the Special Committee, and his colleagues and other associated members of the Secretariat for their assistance, which facilitated my task as Rapporteur.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Papua New Guinea to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/52/L.64.

Mr. Ovia (Papua New Guinea): As this is my maiden address to this Assembly, it gives me great pleasure to address the General Assembly on behalf of my Permanent Representative, Ambassador Utula Samana, Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

I am speaking today to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/52/L.64 on the question of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which is sponsored by Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Fiji, Grenada, Indonesia, Mali, Saint Lucia, the Syrian Arab Republic and my own country, Papua New Guinea.

After some consultations, the sponsors have agreed to revise operative paragraph 15 to reflect some of the concerns that have been expressed to us.

While adhering to the principles inherent in the Declaration, the Special Committee has in recent years considered the question of decolonization in a more realistic and pragmatic manner, taking into account the prevailing international situation, as well as recognizing the specific conditions in the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories.

It is universally recognized that decolonization is one of the greatest achievements of our Organization. The vast majority of the States here today are here because of the Special Committee. Should this world body, after having achieved so much in the field of decolonization, ignore the plight of the peoples of the remaining 17 Non-Self-Governing Territories? Should we, at this juncture in the work of the United Nations, ignore our moral responsibilities to assist the peoples of the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories to have the opportunity to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination, in conformity with the international legal norms we are obligated to uphold? The answer is definitely no.

On the basis of the existing mandate of the United Nations and the moral responsibilities incumbent upon us, the agenda on decolonization deserves adequate recognition and priority with respect to the defence of the rights of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. I am sure that the General Assembly will continue to stand firm, as it has always done, in fulfilling its obligations in the field of decolonization.

The peoples of the remaining 17 Non-Self-Governing Territories, through their elected representatives, have consistently and rightfully called upon the United Nations to maintain vigilance and, specifically, to urge the international community to focus particularly on the social, economic and political developments of their Territories in a manner that will facilitate their progress towards self-determination.

The international community, and the administering Powers in particular, have an obligation under the legal and customary norms of the United Nations to implement the goals of the Declaration. Where administering Powers have cooperated in the work of the Special Committee, both in terms of participating in its formal sessions and in allowing visiting missions to visit Territories to ensure transparency in the implementation of the requirements of the International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism, much progress has been achieved in assisting the constitutional, political and economic development of the Territories, thereby enabling the peoples of the Territories to gain greater autonomy and responsibility in governing themselves.

Some have argued that, given the changing international climate and the difficulties faced by these Territories, complete independence may not be viable and that therefore the question of decolonization may be a non-priority, and that the international community may be wasting time and energy in considering these issues. However, the great majority of the Assembly is committed to seeing to it that the goals of the International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism are achieved by the year 2000.

It is precisely because of our recognition of the specific and peculiar problems faced by the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories — most of which are small island Territories that suffer from impediments created by the interplay of such factors as economic and geographic size, isolation, vulnerability to natural disasters and lack of technological and financial resources, including problems of accessibility to international credit markets — that the international community should give specific priority and attention to the process of decolonization affecting the peoples of those Territories.

The Special Committee is fully aware of the impediments that may limit the options for full and complete independence, but they should not therefore be used as a rationale for maintaining colonial situations. They should not be used as an excuse to undermine and deprive the peoples of the Territories concerned of their ability to gain their rightful political status and autonomy, to control and develop their resources and to pursue development goals and objectives suited to their political, economic and cultural interests. The Special Committee, however, made serious efforts, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV), to look at options that are more suited to responding to the

circumstances of the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories. This would not have been possible without the product of the work of the regional seminars.

The principles inherent in the Declaration are specific and clear on the question of the right of peoples freely to determine their political status in accordance with their own wishes. Within the framework of the Declaration, the Special Committee is entrusted with the task of continuously seeking suitable ways and means of implementing requirements of the Declaration, with the cooperation of the administering Powers.

The Special Committee has continued to carry out its mandate judiciously and faithfully. Over the years it has diligently pursued its task of reviewing the situation in the Non-Self-Governing Territories, hearing petitioners, sending visiting missions to the Territories, disseminating information on decolonization with a view to mobilizing public opinion and making suggestions and recommendations on the progress and the extent of the implementation of the Declaration and reporting to the General Assembly.

This noble mission of eradicating colonialism remains unaccomplished. The Special Committee has constantly reviewed its approaches and rationalized its methods of work, improving its efficiency and making adjustments where appropriate in response to the changing circumstances and in line with the new developments in the international community.

In its endeavour to keep up with changing circumstances and situations, the Special Committee, however, has remained conscious of its ultimate responsibility for safeguarding and protecting the interests and welfare of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, guided by their specific needs and aspirations.

The adoption by the General Assembly in 1991 of a Plan of Action for the International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism gave further impetus to the work of the United Nations in the process of eradicating colonialism. The International Decade's specific Plan of Action is aimed at ushering in a world free of colonialism in the twenty-first century.

While the General Assembly has repeatedly reaffirmed that such factors as population size and remoteness should not prevent the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories from freely exercising their rights to self-determination, the Special Committee is cognizant of the fact that complete decolonization by the year 2000 will require innovative and realistic solutions that can be achieved only with the cooperation and active participation of the administering Powers in the work of the Special Committee. The Special Committee will continue to open its doors to dialogue and consultation in order to reach consensus and cooperation with the administering Powers, which we all believe are critical in facilitating speedy progress towards achieving the objectives of decolonization.

However, such dialogue and consultation must have a clear objective of serving the interests of the peoples concerned, interests that the international community is obligated to uphold. Dialogue and consultation must focus on how best we can collectively pursue the process of decolonization within the framework of the legal and customary norms of the United Nations, and must not be aimed at redefining and shifting basic principles to suit other interests that may be contrary to the wishes of the peoples.

It is extremely important that the cooperation between the Special Committee and the administering Powers play a critical role in the search for specific measures that would promote the kind of development that will eventually enable the peoples of those Territories to exercise their right to self-determination.

The sponsors of this draft resolution are concerned about the attempts to prevent the implementation of a decision of the Secretary-General contained in document A/52/531, thereby diminishing the decolonization programme in the United Nations system.

The recently published document A/52/303/Add.1 does not reflect the commitment of the Secretary-General regarding the full implementation of subprogramme 1.6 of the medium-term plan for the period 1998-2001. It is therefore our understanding that the implementation of the medium-term plan entails that the stand-alone Decolonization Unit be maintained in the Department of Political Affairs and that it be viable and properly staffed — including by the Secretary of the Special Committee and officers at the P-5 and P-4 levels. At this critical juncture of the global efforts to eradicate colonialism by the year 2000, the Decolonization Unit should be availed of all the resources required by the programme, in accordance with the medium-term plan, which without any doubt would enhance our progress towards a world free from colonialism and better for all.

In conclusion, I should like to propose that the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution, which is the same as the previous year's, with the minor revisions that I will present. And in the light of the changing mood to improve cooperation and consultations between all parties, I should like to urge that we adopt this draft resolution without a vote.

The revisions that I will introduce refer to operative paragraph 15 of draft resolution A/52/L.64. The revisions are as follows:

"*Welcomes* the decision of the Secretary-General on 27 October 1997:

(a) that the substantive responsibilities for the Decolonization Programme will be maintained in the Department of Political Affairs;

(b) to establish a stand-alone Decolonization Unit with the necessary resources to provide substantive input for the work of the Special Committee of 24;

(c) that the Department of General Assembly Affairs and Conference Services will be responsible for the technical secretariat servicing relating to the Decolonization Programme, as outlined in his letter of 17 March 1997;

(d) and his commitment to implement subprogramme 1.6 of the medium-term plan, 1998-2001".

These revisions are necessary because of the difficulties that some delegations encountered during the consultations.

The President: Members have just heard the representative of Papua New Guinea orally revise operative paragraph 15 of draft resolution A/52/L.64 and present the new version to members. For the convenience of representatives, this text will be distributed shortly to all delegations in the Hall.

Mr. Núñez-Mosquera (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The decolonization of peoples under colonial domination is one of the areas in which the United Nations has accomplished praiseworthy work. Since the adoption in 1960 of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, many States have attained independence and swelled the ranks of Organization.

But we cannot remain satisfied with what has b achieved so far. We are commemorating today the fo ninth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Hu Rights, which regards the right to self-determinatio an inalienable human right. But regrettably, as we st today on the threshold of the twenty-first century, m peoples are being denied that right. Year after y dozens of petitioners come to seek the assistance and l of the United Nations in their struggle to exercise right to self-determination and independence, and cannot close our eyes to this fact.

We note with satisfaction the dialogue that t place last year between the members of the Spe Political and Decolonization Committee and cer administering Powers. This is a positive sign, but dialogue must be established on a formal basis, and results must yield tangible benefits for the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

The United Nations has a responsibility to discha in this area, and the machinery available to us for purpose is the Decolonization Committee. It is for reason that we attach key importance to strengthening Decolonization Committee and to the need to endo with the resources it vitally needs for its work.

The report submitted to us by the Committe clear and precise. It is very important to promote activities by means, among other things, of hol seminars on decolonization issues and by sending visi missions to the Non-Self-Governing Territories, mak it possible to obtain firsthand information concerning real state of affairs there.

Decolonization activities, by their very nature, essentially political. For this reason, we note satisfaction the Secretary-General's decision to keep Decolonization Unit in the Department of Political Aff and to provide it with all the necessary resources accordance with the medium-term plan for the pe 1998-2001.

In order to achieve this objective and to make work of the United Nations in the area of decoloniza genuinely effective, the human and financial resou earmarked for the execution of the activities of programme 1.6 of the medium-term plan, as wel those associated with the activities of the Decoloniza

Committee, must be retained in the Department of Political Affairs. The Cuban delegation accordingly hopes that a clear-cut decision to this effect will be taken in the context of the negotiations to be held on the programme budget for the biennium 1998-1999.

The President: We have heard the only speaker in the debate on this item.

I should like to inform members that action on the draft resolutions submitted under this item will be taken after the General Assembly has concluded its consideration of all the reports of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee. Action will therefore be taken before the meeting is adjourned.

Reports of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee)

The President: The General Assembly will now consider the reports of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) on agenda items 84 to 90, 91 and 18, 92 and 12, 93, 94, as well as 18.

I request the Rapporteur of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee, Ms. Riitta Resch of Finland, to introduce the reports of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee in one intervention.

Ms. Resch (Finland), Rapporteur of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee): It is my pleasant duty to present to the General Assembly the reports of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) for its consideration and approval.

This year the Assembly allocated agenda items 12, 18, and 84 to 94 — that is 13 agenda items — to the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) for its consideration. The Committee held 25 meetings and concluded its work on Wednesday, 26 November 1997, thereby responding to the Assembly's appeal that it conduct the work of this session in a new spirit of rationalization and in a way making better use of the Organization's conference resources and facilities. This result was possible thanks to various factors including the spirit of open cooperation and conciliation that prevailed in the Committee.

It is my pleasure now to introduce the following reports of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) to the General Assembly for its consideration and approval.

Under agenda item 18, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples", the Fourth Committee recommends, in paragraph 31 of document A/52/613, the adoption of 16 draft resolutions. In this connection, I wish to draw attention to a minor technical error in that document. The heading "Consideration of proposals", which precedes paragraph 11, should be enumerated "II", and the following line, "Draft resolution A/C.452/L.4 and Rev.1", should be enumerated "A".

Under agenda item 84, entitled "Effects of atomic radiation", the Fourth Committee recommends, in paragraph 8 of document A/52/614, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under agenda item 85, entitled "International cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space", the Fourth Committee recommends, in paragraph 11 of document A/52/615, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under agenda item 86, entitled "United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East", the Fourth Committee recommends, in paragraph 29 of document A/52/616, the adoption of seven draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 87, entitled "Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories", the Fourth Committee recommends, in paragraph 16 of document A/52/617, the adoption of five draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 88, entitled "Comprehensive review of the whole question of peacekeeping operations in all their aspects", the Fourth Committee recommends, in paragraph 9 of document A/52/618, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under agenda item 89, entitled "Questions relating to information", the Fourth Committee recommends, in paragraphs 8 and 9 of document A/52/619, the adoption of two draft resolutions and one draft decision.

Under agenda item 90, entitled "Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 *e* of the Charter of the United Nations", the Fourth

Committee recommends, in paragraph 7 of document A/52/620, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under agenda items 91 and 18, entitled respectively "Activities of foreign economic and other interests which impede the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in territories under colonial domination" and "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples", the Special Political and Decolonization Committee recommends, in paragraphs 10 and 11 of document A/52/621, the adoption of one draft resolution and one draft decision.

Under agenda items 92 and 12, entitled respectively "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations" and "Report of the Economic and Social Council", the Special Political and Decolonization Committee recommends, in paragraph 7 of document A/52/622, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under agenda item 93, entitled "Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories", the Fourth Committee recommends, in paragraph 6 of document A/52/623, the adoption of one draft resolution.

In connection with agenda item 94, entitled "The situation in the occupied territories of Croatia", the Fourth Committee, on the recommendation of the Chairman and in order to meet the wishes of the sponsor of the item, decided not to take any action on that agenda item. In accordance with that decision, this agenda item will not be included in the agenda of future sessions of the General Assembly.

That concludes my presentation of the reports of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee). I may have unduly taxed the patience of the Assembly, but I hope that delegations will agree that the work and the achievements of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee at this session deserved an item-by-item presentation, no matter how sketchy.

Before I leave the rostrum, I should like to take this opportunity to pay a special tribute to all those who contributed to the success of the work of the Committee at the fifty-second session. First of all, I wish to congratulate all representatives and colleagues in the Committee, who demonstrated their high professional skills and their willingness to cooperate in reaching mutually satisfactory solutions, and who made it possible for the Committee to carry out its work in a very constructive and efficient manner.

I should like to address a special word of thanks to the Chairman of the Committee, His Excellency Ambassador Machivenyika Tobias Mapuranga, whose diplomatic skills and patience helped the Committee to conduct its deliberations efficiently and in a businesslike manner. The Chairman was assisted by two able Vice-Chairmen, Mr. Petru Dumitriu and Mr. Ravjaa Mounkhou, with whom, in my capacity as Rapporteur, I had the honour to serve in the Bureau of the Committee.

I should also like to express my appreciation to the Under-Secretary-General for General Assembly Affairs and Conference Services, Mr. Jin Yongjian, for his valuable contribution, and to the Director of the General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs Division, Mr. Vadim Perfiliev, for his assistance and contribution.

I also take great pleasure in warmly thanking the Committee Secretary, Mr. Mohammad Sattar, whose ability and vast experience contributed greatly to the successful and timely conclusion of our work. I should also like to thank all the staff of the secretariat of the Committee, who provided such dedicated services to the Committee and who made a real contribution to the smooth functioning of the Committee's work.

Last but not least, my thanks go also to all the interpreters, translators, conference officers and documents officers who contributed to the work of the Committee and to its successful conclusion.

The President: I would like to commend the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) and its Chairman for the timely conclusion of its activities in accordance with the decision the General Assembly adopted at the beginning of our work.

If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall take it that the General Assembly decides not to discuss the reports of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) which are before the Assembly.

It was so decided.

The President: Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote.

The positions of delegations regarding the recommendations of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records. May I remind members that under paragraph 7 of decision 34/401, the General Assembly agreed that:

> "When the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, i.e., either in the Committee or in plenary meeting unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee".

May I also remind delegations that, also in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Before we begin to take action on the recommendations contained in the reports of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee), I should like to advise representatives that we are going to proceed to take decisions in the same manner as was done in the Committee, unless the Secretariat is notified to the contrary in advance. This means that where recorded votes were taken, we will do the same.

I should also hope that we may proceed to adopt without a vote those recommendations that were adopted without a vote in the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee).

Agenda item 84

Effects of atomic radiation

Report of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) (A/52/614)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) in paragraph 8 of its report.

The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 52/55).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 84?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 85

International cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space

Report of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) (A/52/615)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) in paragraph 11 of its report.

The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 52/56).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 85?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 86

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East

Report of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) (A/52/616)

The President: Before the Assembly takes decisions on the draft resolutions recommended in the report of the Committee, I shall call on the representative of the United Arab Emirates, who wishes to make a statement in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. Samhan Al-Nuaimi (United Arab Emirates) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation, which is chairing the Arab Group this month, wishes to make a statement in explanation of vote on draft resolution I, on assistance to Palestine refugees. Despite the fact that we

will vote in favour of the draft resolution, we would like to express a reservation about the fourth preambular paragraph, which refers to the Multilateral Working Group on Refugees in the context of the Middle East peace process. This reservation is based on the decision of the Council of Arab Foreign Ministers to suspend Arab participation in the multilateral committees until tangible progress is achieved in the peace process, particularly on the bilateral tracks, and until the Israeli Government has fulfilled its commitment to implement the signed agreements and obligations already subscribed to in accordance with the relevant Security Council resolutions and other resolutions.

We have strenuously endeavoured to reach agreement on this issue with the sponsors of the draft resolution. However, regrettably, the sponsors insisted on maintaining the paragraph as it was, thus ignoring the Arab position on this issue. As the Arab countries are directly concerned with this question, we had hoped that this paragraph would reflect Arab concerns as well as the fact that these Committees had not met since the stalling and freezing of the peace process because of the behaviour, the measures and the policy adopted by the present Israeli Government, which do not contribute to the achievement of peace, security and stability in the area.

Although we highly appreciate European efforts and their continuous support for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, we regret that they have not taken into account the positions of the parties directly concerned. This is particularly so, in view of the fact that these positions are in line with the decisions of the international legitimacy relevant to the issue.

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the seven draft resolutions recommended by the Special Political and Decolonization Committee in paragraph 29 of its report. After all the votes have been taken, representatives will again have an opportunity to explain their votes and positions.

We turn first to draft resolution I, "Assistance to Palestine refugees".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel

Abstaining:

Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America

Draft resolution I was adopted by 159 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions (resolution 52/57).

The President: We now turn to draft resolution II, "Working Group on the Financing of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East".

The Special Political and Decolonization Committee adopted draft resolution II without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 52/58).

The President: We turn next to draft resolution III, "Persons displaced as a result of the June 1967 and subsequent hostilities".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Micronesia (Federated States of)

Draft resolution III was adopted by 159 votes to 2, with 1 abstention (resolution 52/59).

The President: We turn next to draft resolution IV, "Offers by Member States of grants and scholarships for higher education,
including vocational training, for Palestine refugees".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar,

Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Israel

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 163 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 52/60).

The President: We turn now to draft resolution V, "Operations of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Zambia

Draft resolution V was adopted by 158 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions (resolution 52/61).

The President: We come now to draft resolution VI, "Palestine refugees' properties and their revenues".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo,

Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Liberia, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of)

Draft resolution VI was adopted by 158 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions (resolution 52/62).

The President: We now turn to draft resolution VII, "University of Jerusalem 'Al-Quds' for Palestine refugees".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Liberia, Micronesia (Federated States of), Zambia

Draft resolution VII was adopted by 158 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions (resolution 52/63).

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Israel, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote.

Mr. Tourgeman (Israel): My delegation considers the Palestinian refugee problem as a purely humanitarian problem and cooperates fully with the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA). My delegation would have supported the draft resolutions on UNRWA, which could have also been combined into one or two instead of seven draft resolutions, had they not included a paragraph with political implications, which my country cannot accept.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 86?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 87

Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories

Report of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) (A/52/617)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the five draft resolutions recommended by the Special Political and Decolonization Committee in paragraph 16 of its report (A/52/617). After all the votes have been taken, representatives will again have the opportunity to explain their vote.

We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled "Work of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zambia

Draft resolution I was adopted by 83 votes to 2, with 72 abstentions (resolution 52/64).

The President: We turn now to draft resolution II, entitled "Applicability of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, to the occupied Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem, and the other occupied Arab territories".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Swaziland

Draft resolution II was adopted by 156 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions (resolution 52/65).

The President: Now we shall turn to draft resolution III, entitled "Israeli settlements in the occupied Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem, and the occupied Syrian Golan".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bulgaria, Liberia, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nicaragua, Swaziland, Uruguay

Draft resolution III was adopted by 149 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions (resolution 52/66).

The President: We turn now to draft resolution IV, entitled "Israeli practices affecting the human rights of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Democratic Republic of the Congo, Liberia, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nicaragua, Swaziland, Zambia

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 151 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions (resolution 52/67).

The President: We turn last to draft resolution V, entitled "The occupied Syrian Golan".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia,

Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:
Israel

Abstaining:
Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nicaragua, Swaziland, United States of America, Uruguay, Zambia

Draft resolution V was adopted by 152 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions (resolution 52/68).

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic who wishes to make a statement in explanation of vote.

Mr. Wehbe (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It will be extremely difficult to express the depth of our appreciation to the Member States that sponsored and voted in favour of the draft resolution on the occupied Syrian Golan, whether in the Fourth Committee or in this Assembly.

This is particularly so since voting in favour of the draft resolution by such an overwhelming majority constitutes a clear message which coincides with today's United Nations commemoration of the anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, presided over by you, Mr. President.

And it is particularly so in view of the fact that Israel continues to occupy Arab territories, including Jerusalem, the Syrian Golan and southern Lebanon. The will of the majority in the international Organization is an embodiment of world democracy and is therefore an absolutely clear message addressed to Israel, a message that condemns Israel's violations of the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War and requests Israel, as the occupying Power, to put an end to its imposition of Israeli identity cards and nationality on the Syrian citizens in the Golan and to end other repressive measures against the Syrian population there.

To support this resolution is indeed to support human rights, which are the basis of our humanity, particularly in view of the fact that human rights are universal and comprehensive and allow human beings to enjoy their true humanity. The struggle for international human rights is a struggle against all forms of oppression and injustice at all times and in all places.

It is indeed considered a struggle against colonialism and apartheid. This is what was stated and confirmed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations in his message today on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 87?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 88

Comprehensive review of the whole question of peacekeeping operations in all their aspects

Report of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) (A/52/618)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) in paragraph 9 of its report.

The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote.

May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 52/69).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 88?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 89

Questions relating to information

Report of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) (A/52/619)

The President: The Assembly has before it draft resolutions A and B recommended by the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) in paragraph 8 of its report and a draft decision recommended by the Committee in paragraph 9 of the same report.

The Assembly will first turn to draft resolution A, entitled "Information in the service of humanity".

The Committee adopted draft resolution A without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution A was adopted (resolution 52/70 A).

The President: Draft resolution B is entitled "United Nations public information policies and activities".

The Committee adopted draft resolution B without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution B was adopted (resolution 52/70 B).

The President: The Assembly will next turn to the draft decision entitled "Increase in the membership of the Committee on Information", recommended by the Committee in paragraph 9 of its report.

The Committee adopted the draft decision without a vote.

May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft decision was adopted.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 89?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 90

Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 *e* of the Charter of the United Nations

Report of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) (A/52/620)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) in paragraph 7 of its report.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri

Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:
None

Abstaining:
France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The draft resolution was adopted by 161 votes to 0, with 4 abstentions (resolution 52/71).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 90?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 91 and agenda item 18 *(continued)*

Activities of foreign economic and other interests which impede the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Territories under colonial domination

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

Report of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) (A/52/621)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Special Political and Decolonization Committee in paragraph 10 of its report (A/52/621) and the draft decision recommended by the Committee in paragraph 11 of the same report.

We turn first to the draft resolution, entitled "Economic and other activities which affect the interests of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:
Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:
Israel, Marshall Islands, United States of America

Abstaining:
Bulgaria, Equatorial Guinea, France, Micronesia (Federated States of), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The draft resolution was adopted by 156 votes to 3, with 5 abstentions (resolution 52/72).

The President: We now turn to the draft decision, entitled "Military activities and arrangements by colonial Powers in Territories under their administration".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa. Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Kyrgyzstan, Republic of Korea

The draft decision was adopted by 108 votes to 51, with 3 abstentions.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 91?

It was so decided.

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 18.

Agenda item 92 and agenda item 12 *(continued)*

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations

Report of the Economic and Social Council

Report of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (A/52/622)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Special Political and Decolonization Committee in paragraph 7 of its report (A/52/622).

The draft resolution is entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt,

El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The draft resolution was adopted by 117 votes to none, with 50 abstentions (resolution 52/73).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 92?

It was so decided.

The President: The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 12.

Agenda item 93

Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories

Report of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) (A/52/623)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Special Political and Decolonization Committee in paragraph 6 of its report (A/52/623).

The Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote.

May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 52/74).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 93?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 94

The situation in the occupied territories of Croatia

Report of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) (A/52/624)

The President: May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to take note of the report of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) contained in document A/52/624?

It was so decided.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 94?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 18 *(continued)*

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

Report of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) (A/52/613)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the three draft resolutions recommended by the Special Political and Decolonization Committee in paragraph 31 of its report and on the draft decision recommended by the Committee in paragraph 32 of the report.

We turn first to the three draft resolutions contained in paragraph 31 of the report.

Draft resolution I is entitled "Question of Western Sahara".

The Special Political and Decolonization Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 52/75).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Question of New Caledonia".

The Special Political and Decolonization Committee adopted draft resolution II without objection.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 52/76).

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled "Questions of American Samoa, Anguilla, Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, Guam, Montserrat, Pitcairn, St. Helena, Tokelau, the Turks and Caicos Islands and the United States Virgin Islands".

The Special Political and Decolonization Committee adopted draft resolution III without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 52/77).

The President: We turn now to the draft decision contained in paragraph 32 of the report.

The Special Political and Decolonization Committee adopted the draft decision, entitled "Question of Gibraltar", without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft decision was adopted.

The President: We have thus concluded this stage of our consideration of agenda item 18.

The Assembly has thus concluded its consideration of all the reports of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee).

Agenda item 18 *(continued)*

Implementation of the Declaration of the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

Draft resolutions (A/52/L.64, A/52/23 (Part II), Chapter III, para. 10)

The President: The General Assembly will now take action on the draft resolutions submitted under this item.

We shall proceed to consider draft resolution A/52/L.64, as orally revised, and the draft resolution contained in paragraph 10,
part II, chapter III of the report of the Special Committee [A/52/23].

I would like to announce that since the introduction of draft resolution A/52/L.64 Trinidad and Tobago has become a sponsor.

The Assembly will now turn to the two draft resolutions.

The Assembly will first take a decision on draft resolution A/52/L.64, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples", as orally revised.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/52/L.64, as orally revised, was adopted by 139 votes to 2, with 23 abstentions (resolution 52/78).

The President: The Assembly will next take a decision on the draft resolution contained in paragraph 10 of part II, chapter III, of the report of the Special Committee (A/52/23), entitled "Dissemination of information on decolonization".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates,

United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

France, Micronesia (Federated States of), Russian Federation

The draft resolution was adopted by 159 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions (resolution 52/79).

The President: I now call on the representative of the United Kingdom, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote after the voting.

Mr. Gomersall (United Kingdom): My delegation regrets that it has again found it necessary to vote against the draft resolutions on the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and on the dissemination of information on decolonization — draft resolution A/52/L.64 and the draft resolution contained in paragraph 10 of part II, chapter III of document A/52/23.

The latter text does contain elements which, as an administering Power, the United Kingdom can welcome. In particular, we note the recognition that self-determination does not automatically equate to independence and that there are other options available. However, my delegation believes that, at a time of ever more acute financial crisis in the United Nations, placing an obligation on the Department of Political Affairs and the Department of Public Information to publicize decolonization issues represents a serious waste of scarce resources. The basic aim of this resolution is therefore unacceptable to the United Kingdom.

This delegation also regrets that the resolution on the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples continues to contain many egregious examples of language and assumptions that do not reflect the present situation in the Non-Self-Governing Territories. We do not accept that the presence of military bases could in any way constitute an obstacle to the granting of independence or impede their inhabitants from expressing their views on self-determination. Similarly, the text of the resolution appears to accuse the administering Powers of economic exploitation and even of violations of basic human rights. These are claims which we wholeheartedly reject and are without any foundation.

My delegation also finds unacceptable the continued references to colonialism, colonial rule and colonial countries. The presence of such language in this text is all the more regrettable because it is so clearly out of step with the major improvements in other resolutions on decolonization issues over the last year. I am thinking particularly of the so-called omnibus resolution, which has been adopted by consensus for the second year running, and the resolution on economic activities, on which many delegations have been able to change to a more favourable position this year. This delegation's hope would be that the drafters of the two resolutions before us will follow these examples in the future.

My delegation joins with others in recognizing that decolonization is one of the great success stories of the first 50 years of the United Nations and that the principles upheld by this Organization have an enduring validity. We pay tribute to those who have worked successfully and with goodwill in this field, and will continue to fulfil our obligations with regard to the United Kingdom's dependent Territories.

I have already referred to the recent welcome signs of flexibility and compromise shown by the Special Committee of 24. However, the United Kingdom continues to take a different view of the need for a decolonization programme on the current scale. In our view, this is wholly disproportionate to the real remaining problems. The United Nations has more pressing goals, affecting vastly greater numbers of the world's population, and more relevant to today's needs. The activities and structure of this Organization should reflect the world's present and future priorities and not those of the past.

In conclusion, the two resolutions submitted to this General Assembly do nothing to advance the wishes and interests of the peoples of the remaining dependent Territories, which remain the foundation of my Government's policy towards them.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 18?

It was so decided.

Programme of work

The President: I should like to inform members that there will be no plenary meetings tomorrow, Thursday, 11 December.

On Friday, 12 December, in the afternoon, the General Assembly will take up the reports of the Third Committee.

On Monday, 15 December, in the morning, as the first item, the General Assembly will take up agenda item 17 (h), "Appointment of the members of the Consultative Committee on the United Nations Development Fund for Women"; followed by agenda item 17 (i), "Appointment of members of the Committee on Conferences"; agenda item 47, "The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina"; and agenda item 44, "The situation of democracy and human rights in Haiti".

In the afternoon of the same day, as previously announced, the General Assembly will take up the reports of the Sixth Committee.

The meeting rose at 5.05 p.m.

United Nations A/52/PV.70

General Assembly
Fifty-second Session

Official Records

70th plenary meeting
Friday, 12 December 1997, 3 p.m.
New York

President: Mr. Udovenko . . . . . (Ukraine)

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Reports of the Third Committee

The President: This afternoon, the General Assembly will consider the reports of the Third Committee on agenda items 102 to 111, 112 and sub-items (a) to (e), and 12.

I request the Rapporteur of the Third Committee to introduce the reports of the Third Committee in one intervention.

Mrs. Martínez (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am pleased to introduce the following reports of the Third Committee on the items assigned to the Committee by the General Assembly for consideration.

Under agenda item 102, entitled "Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 25 of document A/52/634, the adoption of five draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 103, entitled "Crime prevention and criminal justice", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 22 of document A/52/635, the adoption of seven draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 104, entitled "International drug control", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 8 of document A/52/636, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under agenda item 105, entitled "Advancement of women", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 32 of document A/52/637, the adoption of seven draft resolutions, and, in paragraph 33, the adoption of one draft decision. I should like to state that draft resolutions II and III were considered under both item 105 and item 106, entitled "Implementation of the outcome of the Fourth World Conference on Women".

Under agenda item 106, entitled "Implementation of the outcome of the Fourth World Conference on Women", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 10 of document A/52/638, that one draft resolution be adopted. I should like to point out to the General Assembly that in operative paragraph 47 of the draft resolution entitled "Follow-up to the Fourth World Conference on Women and full implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action", in the English text only, after the words "fifty-second session", delete the word "or".

Under agenda item 107, entitled "Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 24 of document A/52/639, the adoption of five draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 108, entitled "Promotion and protection of the rights of children", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 16 of document A/52/640, the adoption of two draft resolutions and, in paragraph 17, the adoption of one draft decision.

97-86734 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one month of the date of the meeting*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

Under agenda item 109, entitled "Programme of activities of the International Decade of the World's Indigenous People", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 8 of document A/52/641, the adoption of one draft resolution.

Under agenda item 110, entitled "Elimination of racism and racial discrimination", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 22 of document A/52/642, the adoption of three draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 111, entitled "Right of peoples to self-determination", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 22 of document A/52/643, the adoption of three draft resolutions.

Under agenda item 112 (a), entitled "Human rights questions: implementation of human rights instruments", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 23 of document A/52/644/Add.1, the adoption of four draft resolutions and, in paragraph 24, the adoption of one draft decision. I should like to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the fact that in draft resolution III, "Fiftieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights", operative paragraph 2, the words "for all" should be added at the end. Also, at the end of operative paragraph 10, add the words "including the adoption of the Declaration on the Right to Development".

Turning to agenda item 112 (b), entitled "Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 62 of document A/52/644/Add.2, the adoption of 18 draft resolutions and, in paragraph 63, the adoption of one draft decision.

On agenda item 112 (c), entitled "Human rights questions: human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 44 of document A/52/644/Add.3, the adoption of 11 draft resolutions and, in paragraph 45, the adoption of one draft decision. I wish to note that in paragraph 4 of draft resolution X, "Situation of human rights in Rwanda", the words "Special Representative of Rwanda" should be replaced by the words "Special Representative for Rwanda".

On agenda item 112 (d), entitled "Human rights questions: comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 11 of document A/52/644/Add.4, the adoption of one draft resolution and, in paragraph 12, the adoption of one draft decision. I wish to note that in paragraph 5 of the report the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland should be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/52/L.64.

With respect to agenda item 112 (e), entitled "Human rights questions: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights", the Third Committee reports in document A/52/644/Add.5 that no proposals were submitted under this item.

On agenda item 12, entitled "Report of the Economic and Social Council", the Third Committee recommends, in paragraph 9 of document A/52/633, the adoption of two draft decisions. I wish to note that the title of draft decision I was omitted from the report. It should read "Organization of work of the Third Committee and biennial programme of work of the Committee for 1998-1999".

The President: If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall take it that the General Assembly decides not to discuss the reports of the Third Committee that are before the Assembly today.

It was so decided.

The President: Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote or position. The positions of delegations regarding the recommendations of the Third Committee have been made in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records. May I remind members that by paragraph 7 of decision 34/401 the Assembly agreed that

> "When the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, *i.e.*, either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee."

May I remind delegations that, also in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Before we begin to take action on the recommendations contained in the reports of the Third

Committee, I should like to advise representatives that we are going to proceed to take decisions in the same manner as was done in the Committee, unless the Secretariat is notified otherwise in advance. This means that where recorded votes and a separate vote were taken in the Committee, the Assembly will do the same.

I also hope that we shall be able to proceed to adopt without a vote those recommendations that were adopted without a vote in the Third Committee.

Agenda item 102

Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family

Report of the Third Committee (A/52/634)

The President: The General Assembly will now take a decision on the five draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 25 of its report (A/52/634).

We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled "International Year of Older Persons: towards a society for all ages".

Draft resolution I was adopted by the Third Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly too wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 52/80).

The President: Draft resolution II, entitled "Follow-up to the International Year of the Family", was adopted by the Third Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly too wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 52/81).

The President: Draft resolution III, entitled "Implementation of the World Programme of Action concerning Disabled Persons: towards a society for all in the twenty-first century", was adopted by the Third Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt this draft resolution?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 52/82).

The President: Draft resolution IV, entitled "Policies and programmes involving youth", was adopted by the Third Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly too wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 52/83).

The President: Draft resolution V, entitled "Education for all", was adopted by the Third Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes also to adopt this draft resolution?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 52/84).

The President: I call on the representative of Egypt.

Mr. Wissa (Egypt): I wish to put on record that my delegation had wished to join in sponsoring draft resolution V, entitled "Education for all", but as the Third Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 102, we were unable to do so.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 102?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 103

Crime prevention and criminal justice

Report of the Third Committee (A/52/635)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the seven draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 22 of its report contained in document A/52/635.

We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled "Follow-up to the Naples Political Declaration and Global Action Plan against Organized Transnational Crime".

The Third Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 52/85).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Crime prevention and criminal justice measures to eliminate violence against women".

The Third Committee adopted draft resolution II without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 52/86).

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled "International cooperation against corruption and bribery in international commercial transactions".

The Third Committee adopted this draft resolution without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 52/87).

The President: Draft resolution IV is entitled "International cooperation in criminal matters".

The Third Committee adopted this draft resolution without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 52/88).

The President: Draft resolution V is entitled "United Nations African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders".

The Third Committee adopted this draft resolution without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 52/89).

The President: Draft resolution VI is entitled "Strengthening the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme, particularly its technical cooperation capacity".

The Third Committee adopted this draft resolution without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 52/90).

The President: Draft resolution VII is entitled "Preparations for the Tenth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders".

The Third Committee adopted this draft resolution without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution VII was adopted (resolution 52/91).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 103?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 104

International drug control

Report of the Third Committee (A/52/636)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 8 of its report contained in document A/52/636.

The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution, entitled "International action to combat drug abuse and illicit production and trafficking", without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 52/92).

The President: We have concluded this stage of our consideration of agenda item 104.

Agenda item 105

Advancement of women

Report of the Third Committee (A/52/637)

The President: The Assembly has before it seven draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 32 of its report contained in document A/52/637 and one draft decision recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 33 of the same report.

I shall put the seven draft resolutions and the draft decision to the Assembly one by one. After all the decisions have been taken, representatives will again have the opportunity to explain their votes or positions.

I shall now give the floor to those representatives who wish to make statements in explanation of vote or position before action is taken.

Ms. Wahbi (Sudan): We wish to explain our vote on the draft resolution entitled "Improvement of the situation of women in rural areas", contained in the report of the Third Committee to the General Assembly (A/52/637).

The Sudan has been a sponsor of draft resolutions on this subject for a long time. The Sudanese Government decided to sponsor such resolutions in the past because of the realization that rural women are very vulnerable, and there is a real need to improve their situation, particularly in developing countries, including in the Sudan.

Unfortunately, this year it was difficult for our delegation to even join the consensus on this draft, because of the controversial language introduced into the text. This has changed last year's agreed language that was acceptable to all delegations.

The reason why Sudan joined the consensus in the end was that most paragraphs of the draft resolution aim at improving the situation of rural women so that they may become effective participants in society. Moreover, the draft urges States and the international community to take the necessary measures to empower rural women, to respond to their needs and to pull them up from the economic conditions in which many live, particularly in the developing countries.

In spite of these noble aims, which we fully support, the Sudan is obliged to express its reservation on operative paragraph 2 (e). The reasons for this position are follows: first, the paragraph attempts to distort the agreed language of international conferences, particularly the language of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, which were negotiated in depth. Moreover, the new language introduced into the paragraph results in unacceptable ambiguity.

Secondly, the deviation which took place in this paragraph, particularly the reference to inheritance, can be interpreted as contradicting Islamic law, the shariah.

Thirdly, the Sudan's confirmed position is to strongly reject any language that contradicts Islamic law. We do not consider ourselves parties to such language; nor can it be binding on us. Such language cannot be considered agreed language. Therefore, it cannot be used in the future as such.

Women's inheritance was a controversial issue during previous international conferences and during many negotiations on various international instruments. The bottom line for consensus was quite clear. It was evident that divergent approaches and viewpoints existed and that there were specific points on which no consensus could ever be reached. Therefore, attempts to force a consensus are completely unacceptable.

As for the position of Islamic law concerning the inheritance of women, we would like to clarify the following points: first, Islam grants all women the equal right to inherit; secondly, the division of inheritance in Islam is not based on gender; and thirdly, according to Islamic law inheritance is distributed to the relatives on the basis of the degree of relationship to the deceased — for example, the mother of a deceased person would inherit one-eighth of the assets: money, land, et cetera. And a mother is a woman. This could be more than the share of a number of males in the family, including sons of the deceased.

The United Nations has continued to call for respect for the principle of tolerance between religions, countries and peoples. Therefore, we question today the reasons which make some compel us, as Muslims, to justify our beliefs and religion, or for others to look down on a sacred religion by calling it a "philosophy". This attitude motivates us to renew once more our call for respect for the beliefs of others and for the recognition of the diversities which really exist in the world.

Mr. Kasanda (Zambia): At the time that the Third Committee took action on the resolution entitled

"Improvement of the situation of women in rural areas", my delegation reserved its right to make a general statement in explanation of position.

Zambia became a sponsor of this resolution because we attach great importance to the situation of rural women. In Zambia, 60 per cent of our population live in rural areas, and the majority are women. In Africa, women constitute the majority of the population and are, in fact, one of the continent's greatest assets, in that they are responsible for 60 to 80 per cent of food production. Food is produced predominantly by rural women.

Zambia had the privilege of making a statement in the Third Committee on behalf of the members of the Southern African Development Community (SADC), in which we elaborated on the vital importance of the right of ownership of land for rural women. We pointed out that land tenure practices usually ensure male control of activities and the allocation of the best land and agricultural input for export crops. We further pointed out that inheritance practices, whereby land traditionally passes from father to son — thus denying women their right to inheritance, let alone their right to equal inheritance — further reinforce male control and exacerbate the poverty of women.

In addressing the issue of the feminization of poverty, one of the key issues that has been identified is that of land ownership. A definite link has been made between poverty and the absence of land ownership. It is a proven fact that land ownership facilitates access to a range of benefits and opportunities, and the disproportionate enjoyment by men of rights to land excludes women from those benefits and opportunities. Without title to land, women's access to agricultural support services, particularly credit and extension services, where land ownership is expected as collateral or as a precondition, is drastically limited.

The majority of land in Africa is agricultural land subject to traditional inheritance practices, and therefore the right to equal inheritance of land by women becomes vitally important. It lies at the very heart of women's economic empowerment, especially for rural women who may not be able to purchase title to land. The issue is also a question of development. Any meaningful development is not possible when more than half of a population are denied the right to own land, which is a major productive resource.

It is also a question of human rights. Everyone is born equal and has the right to be treated equally. The issue of land rights discrimination is a matter of human rights. Women are being discriminated against by virtue of their being born as women.

For these reasons the delegation of Zambia will, in all appropriate forums, continue to advocate the enactment of laws that will guarantee women the right to equal inheritance. In this light, we wish to express our gratitude to the delegation of Mongolia for its excellent work and patience in striving to achieve consensus on this draft resolution. We also wish to express our gratitude to all those delegations which worked so hard to maintain the delicate consensus reached in the Commission on the Status of Women on the inheritance language. We regret that a few delegations, which were clearly a minority, chose not to respect and maintain that agreement. We shall, however, remain unrelenting in our pursuit of justice on this very important issue.

Mr. Saleh (Bahrain) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation will join consensus on draft resolution I, entitled "Improvement of the situation of women in rural areas". But we would like to put on record our reservations with regard to operative paragraph 2 (*e*) because it contradicts our Islamic shariah. Islam has guaranteed women their full rights, including the right to inheritance. The Holy Quran provides that the male will have twice as much as the female. Therefore with regard to the issue of inheritance in Islam, there is a definite rule from which we cannot turn aside and which cannot be questioned.

Ms. Mohamed (Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): With regard to the resolution entitled "Improvement of the situation of women in rural areas", we support its adoption by consensus. However, we would also like to make clear that the issue of inheritance in Islam is complex. In Islam, inheritance distribution between the sexes is governed by relationship and kinship. My delegation would like to put on record our reservations about the wording of paragraph 2 (*e*) of the draft resolution.

The President: We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled "Improvement of the situation of women in rural areas".

The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 52/93).

The President: The Third Committee adopted draft resolution II, entitled "United Nations Development Fund for Women", without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 52/94).

The President: The Third Committee adopted draft resolution III, entitled "International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women", without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 52/95).

The President: The Third Committee adopted draft resolution IV, entitled "Improvement of the status of women in the Secretariat", without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 52/96).

The President: The Third Committee adopted draft resolution V, entitled "Violence against women migrant workers", without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 52/97).

The President: The Third Committee adopted draft resolution VI, entitled "Traffic in women and girls", without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to the same?

Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 52/98).

The President: The Third Committee adopted draft resolution VII, entitled "Traditional or customary practices affecting the health of women and girls", without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution VII was adopted (resolution 52/99).

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft decision entitled "Reports considered by the General Assembly in connection with the question of the advancement of women", recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 33 of the report.

May I consider that the Assembly wishes to adopt the draft decision?

The draft decision was adopted.

The President: I call on the representative of Yemen, who wishes to make a statement in explanation of position.

Ms. Mohamed (Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): With regard to the draft resolution on the advancement of women in the Secretariat, we were not present when it as adopted. We wish to express our official support for the draft resolution, as well as our desire to become one of its sponsors.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 105?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 106

Implementation of the outcome of the Fourth World Conference on Women

Report of the Third Committee (A/52/638)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 10 of its report.

The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution, entitled "Follow-up to the Fourth World Conference on Women and full implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action", without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 52/100).

The President: We have concluded this stage of our consideration of agenda item 106.

Agenda item 107

Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions

Report of the Third Committee (A/52/639)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the five draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 24 of its report contained in document A/52/639.

We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled "Assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa", which the Third Committee adopted without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 52/101).

The President: The Third Committee adopted draft resolution II, entitled "Follow-up to the Regional Conference to Address the Problems of Refugees, Displaced Persons, Other Forms of Involuntary Displacement and Returnees in the Countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States and Relevant Neighbouring States", without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 52/102).

The President: The Third Committee adopted draft resolution III, entitled "Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees", without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 52/103).

The President: The Third Committee adopted draft resolution IV, entitled "Continuation of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees", by acclamation.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 52/104).

The President: The Third Committee adopted draft resolution V, entitled "Assistance to unaccompanied refugee minors", without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 52/105).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 107?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 108

Promotion and protection of the rights of children

Report of the Third Committee (A/52/640)

The President: The Assembly has before it two draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 16 of its report contained in document A/52/640 and one draft decision recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 17 of the same report.

We turn first to draft resolution I, which is entitled "The girl child".

The Third Committee adopted draft resolution I, without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 52/106).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled "The rights of the child".

The Third Committee adopted draft resolution II without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 52/107).

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft decision entitled "Reports considered by the General Assembly in connection with the question of the promotion and protection of the rights of children", recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 17 of its report.

May I consider that the Assembly wishes to adopt the draft decision?

The draft decision was adopted.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 108?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 109

Programme of activities of the International Decade of the World's Indigenous People

Report of the Third Committee (A/52/641)

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Fiji, who wishes to speak in explanation of position before a decision is taken.

Mr. Bune (Fiji): Fiji believes that observation of the International Decade of the World's Indigenous People should not be an exercise just to admit that indigenous people still exist in our world. Observation of the Decade should therefore be meaningful and fruitful to the future of indigenous people. It should address the bleak future they now face, through the establishment of an international fund for their survival, development, progress and enhanced future. We must move at a greater speed to adopt the draft United Nations declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples. We must set up as quickly as possible an indigenous-people unit in our Organization. Our ultimate goal should be the adoption of an international convention on the world's indigenous people.

We are also concerned over the lack of progress on the adoption of the draft declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples. An international declaration on such rights is, in our view, an international testimony and commitment to our care, concern and profound interest in the future of our indigenous people. Yet after three meetings, only two of the 45 articles have been adopted. The two adopted are almost negligible with regard to the substantive aspects of indigenous rights, such as self-determination, ownership and control of resources and affirmative-action programmes to promote their development and progress. If observation of the Decade is to be meaningful, the international community, and Member States in particular, should display the political will to finalize the draft declaration as quickly as possible.

We are most concerned over the information on the world's indigenous people on page 43 of the 1997 *Human Development Report*. According to the report, indigenous people have seen their values and customs destroyed by the incoming population and have frequently turned to alcoholism or suicide. In developing countries, they mix to some extent with the majority population, but in the industrial countries, many have ended up on reservations, facing a bleak future. The report went on to state that in almost all societies where they are to be found, indigenous peoples are poorer than most other groups, fare worse in the non-income dimensions of poverty and face discrimination when it comes to employment. The report is a very sad commentary on the fate of the world's indigenous people at a time when we are observing an International Decade of the World's Indigenous People. The question my delegation wishes to ask is, what are we really observing? The bleak future of the world's indigenous people, their victimization and repression in our world, a trend in their treatment which could spell their extinction?

Surely, our observations should be more meaningful and helpful and contribute to the creation of a better future for indigenous people during the decade.

We therefore continue to call for the drafting, negotiation and adoption of an international convention on the world's indigenous people to create a legal framework for their survival, development, progress and future in our world. The indigenous people consider the adoption of the current draft critical to their survival. This was the message that came out clearly from the many representatives of indigenous peoples throughout the world who attended a regional seminar hosted by my Government last year as part of its programme of activities for observance of the Decade of the World's Indigenous People.

We believe that a positive aspect of international observance should be the setting up of a unit for indigenous peoples' affairs in the United Nations, a proposal which my delegation has been espousing consistently over the past few years. In our view, our observance of the Decade would be even more significant and meaningful if such a unit were established.

Finally, my delegation would like to see these matters reflected in the draft resolution on the Decade at our fifty-third session.

In the meantime, Fiji will join the consensus on the draft resolution before us since we still consider it a step in the right direction.

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 8 of its report.

The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote.

May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 52/108).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 109?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 110

Elimination of racism and racial discrimination

Report of the Third Committee (A/52/642)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the three draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 22 of its report contained in document A/52/642.

We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled "Measures to combat contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance".

The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 52/109).

The President: The Third Committee adopted draft resolution II, entitled "Report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination", without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 52/110).

The President: The Third Committee adopted draft resolution III, entitled "Third Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and the convening of a world conference on racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance", without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 52/111).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 110?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 111

Right of peoples to self-determination

Report of the Third Committee (A/52/643)

Mr. Mukhopadhaya (India): India would like to be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution III, on the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, which forms part of the report of the Third Committee on this agenda item.

The President: The representative of India's statement will be reflected in the proceedings of the meeting.

The Assembly will now take a decision on the three draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 22 of its report.

We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled "Use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the rights of peoples to self-determination".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Belarus, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, France, Georgia, Greece, Grenada, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution I was adopted by 113 votes to 18, with 41 abstentions (resolution 52/112).

The President: The Third Committee adopted draft resolution II, entitled "Universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination", without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 52/113).

The President: Draft resolution III is entitled "The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea,

Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:
Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:
Dominican Republic, Georgia, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Norway, Uruguay

Draft resolution III was adopted by 160 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions (resolution 52/114).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 111?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 112

Human rights questions

Report of the Third Committee (Part I) (A/52/644)

The President: May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to take note of part I of the report of the Third Committee on agenda item 112, entitled "Human rights questions"?

It was so decided.

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments

Report of the Third Committee (Part II) (A/52/644/Add.1)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the four draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 23 of part II of its report and on the draft decision recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 24 of the report.

We first turn to draft resolution I, entitled "International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families".

The Third Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 52/115).

The President: The Third Committed adopted draft resolution II, entitled "International Covenants on Human Rights", without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 52/116).

The President: Draft resolution III, entitled "Fiftieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights", was adopted by the Third Committee without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution III, as orally revised, without a vote?

Draft resolution III, as orally revised, was adopted (resolution 52/117).

The President: Draft resolution IV is entitled "Effective implementation of international instruments on human rights, including reporting obligations under international instruments on human rights".

A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 21 of draft resolution IV.

As there are no objections to that request, I shall first put to the vote operative paragraph 21.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela

Against:

Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ghana, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Sudan

Abstaining:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, China, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 21 was retained by 118 votes to 5, with 37 abstentions.

The President: The Third Committee adopted draft resolution IV as a whole without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution IV, as a whole, was adopted (resolution 52/118).

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft decision recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 24 of its report.

The draft decision is entitled "Documents considered by the General Assembly in connection with implementation of human rights instruments".

May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt the draft decision?

The draft decision was adopted.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (*a*) of agenda item 112?

It was so decided.

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms

Report of the Third Committee (Part III) (A/52/644/Add.2)

The President: The Assembly has before it 18 draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 62 of Part III of its report (A/52/644/Add.2) and one draft decision recommended by the Committee in paragraph 63 of the same report.

I shall put the 18 draft resolutions and the draft decision to the Assembly one by one. After all the decisions have been taken, representatives will have the opportunity to explain their vote.

We turn first to draft resolution I, "Respect for the principles of national sovereignty and non-interference in the internal affairs of States in their electoral processes".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Bolivia, Chile, Ecuador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Kyrgyzstan, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Turkmenistan, Vanuatu

Draft resolution I was adopted by 96 votes to 58, with 12 abstentions (resolution 52/119).

The President: We turn now to draft resolution II, entitled "Human rights and unilateral coercive measures".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Cape Verde, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Georgia, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan,

Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Vanuatu

Draft resolution II was adopted by 91 votes to 46, with 26 abstentions (resolution 52/120).

The President: We turn now to draft resolution III, entitled "Respect for the right to universal freedom of travel and the vital importance of family reunification".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution III was adopted by 94 votes to 1, with 73 abstentions (resolution 52/121).

The President: Draft resolution IV is entitled "Elimination of all forms of religious intolerance".

The Third Committee adopted draft resolution IV without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to likewise?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 52/122).

The President: Draft resolution V is entitled "Effective promotion of the Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities".

The Third Committee adopted draft resolution V without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 52/123).

The President: Draft resolution VI is entitled "Human rights in the administration of justice".

The Third Committee adopted draft resolution VI without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution VI was adopted (resolution 52/124).

The President: Draft resolution VII is entitled 'Strengthening of the rule of law".

The Third Committee adopted draft resolution VII without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution VII was adopted (resolution 52/125).

The President: We now turn to draft resolution VIII, entitled "Protection of United Nations personnel".

The Third Committee adopted draft resolution VIII without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution VIII was adopted (resolution 52/126).

The President: Draft resolution IX is entitled "United Nations Decade for Human Rights Education, 1995-2004, and public information activities in the field of human rights".

The Third Committee adopted draft resolution IX without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IX was adopted (resolution 52/127).

The President: Draft resolution X is entitled "National institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights".

The Third Committee adopted draft resolution X without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution X was adopted (resolution 52/128).

The President: Draft resolution XI is entitled "Strengthening the role of the United Nations in enhancing the effectiveness of the principle of periodic and genuine elections and the promotion of democratization".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Brunei Darussalam, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Myanmar, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution XI was adopted by 157 votes to 0, with 15 abstentions (resolution 52/129).

The President: Draft resolution XII is entitled "Protection of and assistance to internally displaced persons".

The Third Committee adopted draft resolution XII without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XII was adopted (resolution 52/130).

The President: Draft resolution XIII is entitled "Strengthening of United Nations action in the field of human rights through the promotion of international cooperation and the importance of non-selectivity, impartiality and objectivity".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution XIII was adopted by 116 votes to 2, with 50 abstentions (resolution 52/131).

The President: Draft resolution XIV is entitled "Human rights and mass exoduses".

The Third Committee adopted draft resolution XIV without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XIV was adopted (resolution 52/132).

The President: Draft resolution XV is entitled "Human rights and terrorism".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran

(Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu

Draft resolution XV was adopted by 115 votes to 0, with 57 abstentions (resolution 52/133).

The President: Draft resolution XVI is entitled "Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights".

The Third Committee adopted draft resolution XVI without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XVI was adopted (resolution 52/134).

The President: Draft resolution XVII is entitled "Situation of human rights in Cambodia".

The Third Committee adopted this draft resolution without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XVII was adopted (resolution 52/135).

The President: Draft resolution XVIII is entitled "Right to development".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of

Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution XVIII was adopted by 129 votes to 12, with 32 abstentions (resolution 52/136).

[Subsequently, the delegations of Australia, the Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine informed the Secretariat that they had intended to abstain; the delegation of Ghana had intended to vote in favour.]

The President: We next turn to the draft decision contained in paragraph 63 of part III of the report. The Third Committee adopted the draft decision, entitled "Award of human rights prizes in 1998", without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft decision was adopted.

The President: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to make statements in explanation of vote or position.

Mr. Najem (Lebanon) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation has asked to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution XV, entitled "Human rights and terrorism".

At the outset, I wish to stress that Lebanon vigorously condemns all acts of terrorism and believes that terrorism is one of the most terrible scourges of democratic societies. My delegation reiterates its commitment to cooperating fully in the context of any just, equitable and impartial international effort to combat terrorism. In fact, Lebanon has already ratified most of the international conventions against terrorism.

My delegation abstained in the voting on this resolution for the following reasons. First, the resolution does not condemn state terrorism that allows for the occupation of foreign territories, such as the Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon and the western Bekaa and the horrible massacres of our fellow citizens by the Israeli army. We, like many other States, are convinced that foreign occupation is one of the most awful forms of terrorism.

Secondly, the resolution makes no reference to General Assembly resolution 46/51 of 9 December 1991, referred to by the Commission on Human Rights in other resolutions adopted subsequently to emphasize the need to establish a clear definition of the concept of terrorism.

Thirdly, the resolution does not draw a distinction between the right to combat foreign occupation and the just and legitimate struggle of peoples to liberate their territories. The latter is a right enshrined in international law, including the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the United Nations.

Mrs. Castro de Barish (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Costa Rica wishes to explain its non-participation in the voting on draft resolution I, entitled "Respect for the principles of national sovereignty and non-interference in the internal affairs of States in their electoral processes".

We can support many of the principles enunciated and paragraphs contained in the text. However, we do not support the content of the seventh preambular paragraph, especially where it states

> "that political systems and electoral processes are subject to historical, political, cultural and religious factors".

This sentence could serve as a pretext for perpetuating unacceptable past and even current practices in some electoral processes, such as the use of intimidation and violence to affect the results of voting by Governments that wish to remain in power through regimes that are not truly democratic.

For that reason, my delegation preferred not to participate in the voting on this draft resolution.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (b) of agenda item 112?

It was so decided.

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (Part IV) (A/52/644/Add.3)

The President: I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions before the voting on the 11 draft resolutions and one draft decision contained in document A/52/644/Add.3.

Mrs. Dorjee (Bhutan): My delegation has requested the floor to speak in explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolution VI, entitled "Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran".

In accordance with Bhutan's position on country-specific resolutions pertaining to human rights, our delegation will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution. We would, however, like to place on record our reservation on operative paragraph 4 (g) of the text, which addresses the issue of capital punishment. A number of delegations had approached the sponsors with an amendment to delete the words "for apostasy or non-violent crimes" from that paragraph, which we regret, was not accepted.

The deletion would have avoided an intrusive qualification on which crimes may and may not be penalized by capital punishment. We would remind the Committee that no international consensus exists on the abolition of capital punishment. We also point out that article 6 (2) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights allows capital punishment for the most serious crimes. Unlike operative paragraph 4 (g), the Covenant does not attempt to specify which crimes capital punishment may or may not be applied to.

With regard to draft resolution XI, entitled "Situation of human rights in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)", while Bhutan supports the draft resolution, we wish to express our reservations on the seventh preambular paragraph, which calls attention to document A/52/490 of 17 October 1997, the report of the Special Rapporteur. Paragraph 36 of the report includes references to capital punishment, which clearly exceeds the mandate of the Special Rapporteur.

Mr. Rahmtalla (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The delegation of the Sudan would like to make a general statement before the voting on the draft resolution on the situation of human rights in the Sudan, draft resolution IV in the report of the Third Committee contained in document A/52/644/Add.3.

The Government of the Sudan takes a continued interest in human rights; this is a genuine principle of our Government, which has placed the issue of achieving peace and the system of governance in the country at the forefront of its priorities. Proof of that is what has been achieved in the field of human rights since the beginning of this year alone, which we would like to summarize as follows.

First, the Peace Agreement between the Government and all the rebel factions except one was signed on 21 April 1997. That Agreement, known as the Khartoum Agreement, included the issue of human rights and fundamental freedoms. This has been attested to by the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights appointed by the General Assembly to study the situation of human rights in the Sudan. Here, I would like to cite some excerpts by way of example. The Agreement stated:

> "1. The Sudan is a multiracial, multi-ethnic, multicultural and multireligious society. Islam is the religion of the majority of the population and Christianity and the African creeds are followed by a considerable number of citizens. Nevertheless the basis of rights and duties in the Sudan shall be citizenship, and all Sudanese shall equally share in all aspects of life and political responsibilities on the basis of citizenship.
>
> "2. Freedom of religion, belief and worship shall be guaranteed.
>
> "3. A suitable atmosphere shall be maintained for practising, worship, *dawa*, proselytization and preaching.
>
> "4. No citizen shall be coerced to embrace any faith or religion.
>
> "5. There shall be no legislation that would adversely affect the religious rights of any citizen.

"6. a. Shariah and custom shall be sources of legislation".

In separate provisions, the Khartoum Agreement states:

"The Supreme Court is the custodian of the Constitution and is thus entrusted with the protection and interpretation of the Constitution.

"The people of south Sudan shall exercise the right to self-determination through a referendum.

"The Constitution shall enshrine the following principles: a. There shall be no punishment except as provided for by the law; and b. Every person is presumed innocent until the contrary is proved.

"The bill of rights and freedoms shall be enshrined in the Constitution.

"All personal matters such as marriage, divorce, parentage and inheritance shall be governed by the religion and custom of those involved."

Second, following the signing of the Agreement, the Government tried to negotiate with the only rebel faction outside the peace process. It agreed to adopt the Declaration of Principles of the Extraordinary Summit of the Heads of State and Government of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) as a basis for discussion and negotiations. The Sudanese Government participated at the highest levels in the latest talks held under the aegis of IGAD last October, in which it was agreed to resume negotiations next April.

Third, in the field of relief to those affected by war in the country, Sudan's cooperation continued with the process which it initiated in the first place — Operation Lifeline Sudan. Last week, the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs for the Sudan, Mr. van Schaik, visited our country and conducted highly positive negotiations with the Government. In line with these negotiations, new outlets for food distribution to new regions in the country were allowed, including the areas under the control of the sole rebel faction. It is worth mentioning here that some of those who co-sponsored the draft resolution described the results of the visit of the Special Envoy as extremely positive. On our side, we emphasize what they have stated in this regard.

Fourth, the country's independent National Commission for the Preparation of the Permanent Constitution continues its work, with the involvement of all sectors of the Sudanese people. It is expected that it will complete the draft constitution at the beginning of 1998.

Fifth, the Government renewed once more, through its President, the offer of amnesty to all those who bore weapons against the homeland. It also reiterated its invitation for political participation internally by all parties, without any restrictions or exclusions. A great number of politicians and citizens accepted this invitation.

Sixth, the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights, Mr. Gáspár Bíró, was received twice, first in January and then in September 1997. Complete cooperation was accorded him at all levels, official and unofficial, as he stated in his interim report [A/52/510, annex] to this session of the General Assembly.

Seventh, many constitutional decrees were issued in July 1997 providing the framework for human rights and fundamental freedoms contained in the Khartoum Peace Agreement.

Eighth, the Consultative Council for Human Rights, a body comprising various formal and informal circles interested in human rights, has set up a number of fact-finding commissions to verify allegations of human rights violations. A number of these committees have completed their work, and the Special Rapporteur made comments about the results. Efforts still continue in cooperation with him to foster and protect human rights in the Sudan.

Through these comments we intended to provide only some examples of the persistent efforts being made by my country's Government to foster and maintain human rights. However, instead of these accomplishments meeting with recognition and appreciation, we regrettably find that the American delegation and the co-sponsors of the draft resolution insist on submitting a draft resolution which could, at a minimum, be described as devoid of honesty and credibility. It clearly reflects the degree of politicization to which some States have gone in dealing with this noble issue relating to the promotion and preservation of human rights.

When we refer to the politicization of human rights, the finger of blame is always pointed at us and we are

characterized as attempting to run away from upholding the principles of human rights.

However, the targeting of the present Government by the United States does not require any proof. The American declarations on the need to get rid of the current Sudanese Government by any and all means, including military ones — let me reiterate: by any and all means, including military ones — fill all mass media. The visits paid by American officials to the region and to what is described by the United States as "front-line States" is a fact, not a Sudanese allegation. We even find the United States attempting to set the Sudan against its neighbours, with whom the Sudan will continue to foster its relations.

It is clear that all these policies, which have been declared at the highest levels, aim at prolonging the duration of the conflict in the southern part of the Sudan and undermining the efforts of the Sudan Government to establish peace. If we add to this the unilateral imposition of economic sanctions against the Sudan, we find that all these policies cannot be construed in a non-political context. The other proof of that is the statement of the spokesman of the United States State Department that the objective of the unilateral economic sanctions against the Sudan is to exercise political pressure on the elected Sudanese Government and to coerce it into changing its behaviour and seriously to involve itself in the peace talks held in Nairobi. That matter has led to hampering these talks, delaying them until the beginning of next year.

All of these policies emphasize to the States Members of the United Nations the real motives behind the submission of this draft resolution on the human rights situation in the Sudan. These practices constitute a gross violation of internationally binding resolutions in the area of human rights. The Assembly has very recently stated that the imposition of unilateral economic sanctions represents a violation of the economic and humanitarian rights of peoples and adversely affects economic and social development, the right of the individual to live in dignity, and a contravention of the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law.

The insistence of the sponsors in submitting this kind of draft resolutions and the addition of new and negative elements annually are in line with the ongoing campaigns against the orientation of the Sudanese people and its Government. Such campaigns are targeting the tolerant Islamic faith. Otherwise, how can we interpret the addition of a new element to this year's draft resolution which deals with the sexual abuse of children? It is an accusation which would make any Muslim feel ashamed. Some might deny what we are saying, but these attacks are levelled at Islam and at more than 1 billion Muslim believers in the United Nations sanctuary during the celebration of a great occasion — United Nations Human Rights Day — on the pretext of protecting the rights of women. This stands as proof that Islam is the primary target. We cannot accept that some would exploit the rostrum of this international Organization to derogate from an incontrovertible right — the right to faith.

We also denounce any attempts to belittle divine faiths or to subject them to human whims and secular purposes. We strongly denounce any deprecation of Islam or any attempt to distort it or to link it to allegations of violations of human rights, the rights of children and the rights of women or with terrorism. We see in such behaviour a new and enormous challenge facing the international community which should strive to put a stop to this kind of confrontational attitude among various creeds and faiths in this world.

I should like to conclude my statement by saying that the Government of the Sudan will continue its drive towards peace. The insistence of some on ignoring the positive references in the report of the Special Rapporteur to the peace agreement signed in Khartoum on 21 April 1997 and other positive developments by way of fostering human rights in the Sudan will not dissuade the Government from such pursuit. It will not be impeded by the intransigence and inequity manifested by the group of sponsors. The Sudan will continue on its road to achieving peace and good-neighbourliness.

For these reasons, my delegation rejects this draft resolution and calls for a vote thereon. We request that most members of the Assembly reject it. We take this opportunity to draw the attention of the Group of 77 and China to the stand they took, as described on the same day last year by the representative of Costa Rica, to the effect that the Group will ask for a vote on any draft resolution containing the phrase "within existing resources", and that the Group will vote against that phrase, which is mentioned in paragraphs 8 and 21 of the present draft resolution.

It is a source of irony that the European Union and most of its members which are sponsors of this draft resolution rejected that phrase last year. But when the matter is coupled with political objectives, logic vanishes, the human conscience goes to sleep, and the principled stands taken by those European States, which sponsored

this draft resolution in spite of the existence of this phrase therein, are put on hold.

Is this not contradiction in its most glaring manifestations?

The President: May I ask the representative of Sudan to stick to the decision we made in General Assembly resolution 34/401, which sets a time limit of 10 minutes for an explanation of vote. I appeal to that representative to wind up his statement, as he has already exceeded the time limit.

Mr. Erwa (Sudan): I am very grateful to you, Sir. Indeed, I was about to express my appreciation to you. I should like to conclude.

(spoke in Arabic)

My delegation would like to seize this opportunity also to extend its gratitude to all those States that did not support this draft resolution when it was put to the vote in the Third Committee on November 1997. We again call upon the States to uphold justice, not only for the purpose of supporting Sudan, but also for the glorification of the principles of human rights which all of us espouse and for shielding them from political exploitation.

Mr. Rodríguez Parrilla (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): To affirm that gross, systematic and mass human rights violations are taking place in Cuba is vulgar slander. Lauding a ridiculous Special Rapporteur cannot conceal the fact that he is but a pitiful pawn. Though some may feign ignorance, everyone knows that this exercise is a gross political manipulation by the United States against Cuba.

In the last few weeks, the United States submitted a draft resolution endorsing a report that no one knew about and later offered up its sterile resolution as a tribute to Miami's annexationist mafia.

The United States' economic war on Cuba constitutes the only mass, gross and systematic violation of the rights of the Cuban people. This is an irrefutable truth.

We are being accused by the United States, the country that is trying to subjugate a whole people through hunger and disease; the organizer, for almost half a century, of the most unprecedented plans of aggression, and from whose territory, in recent months, terrorist acts against Cuba have been carried out with impunity.

This is also the country of racism and inequality, where the family income of blacks is half that of whites; where infant mortality in the black population is twice that of whites; where the incarceration rate of blacks is six times that of whites; and where the leading cause of death among black youths is homicide, whereas white youths mainly die driving luxurious cars while drunk. There are more young blacks in prison than in college and, at the current rate, an absolute majority of young blacks will in a few years be in prisons or reform schools.

The United States is the country where immigrants are hated, exploited — even literally enslaved — or murdered in a "low-intensity war" on the southern border. It is home to the biggest and most repressive prison system, and it is where one out of every six people executed is innocent. It is where well-known cases of police brutality are on the rise; where there is an increasing number of reported cases of torture of detainees and inmates; and where Puerto Rican political prisoners serve long prison terms, suffer abuse and lack medical care.

In the United States the homeless are growing in number; there are 40 million people with no medical insurance, more than half of them children; domestic violence is on the rise, even against children, who have the highest suicide rate in the developed world. The United States people are of the opinion that they are living in a sick and misguided country, where hopelessness is growing as the economy grows.

We have been told that this draft resolution enjoys broad, even universal sponsorship. That is false. In fact there is one author and a small group of junior partners, some of them original and some what I might call "restored". Two thirds of States Members will not be voting in favour of this infamy. These are the same old sponsors, who share a colonial mentality by which they would put dozens of countries of the South into the dock without recognizing their own inequality, injustice, racism and xenophobia, their violations of the human rights of immigrants and minorities, their unjust and selective deportation policies, the impunity with which the trade in human, even children's, organs operates, and their tolerance of child and "exotic" prostitution.

Also curious is the voting pattern followed by today's sponsors in the draft resolutions adopted by the Third Committee, when they are not devoted to reproving countries of the South. Almost without exception, this

afternoon's sponsors voted against draft resolutions dealing with respect for sovereignty and non-interference in electoral processes and against condemnation of unilateral coercive measures that violate human rights. They also voted against or abstained on draft resolutions on the non-use of mercenaries, and on the right to development — in the latter case protesting a paragraph that promoted the inclusion of the Declaration on the Right to Development in the International Bill of Human Rights. Almost unanimously they also abstained on draft resolutions dealing with freedom of travel and family reunification, with objectivity, impartiality and non-selectivity in the field of human rights, and with terrorism and its connection with human rights.

Moreover, the countries of the European Union, whose differences in the human rights area could be addressed through cooperation and dialogue, are being forced to perform acrobatics in a one-way stream, and they rush to give pleasing explanations every time they defend, even timidly, their own sovereignty from the extraterritorial laws imposed on them by the Empire.

There are also chronic sponsors. One of them is responsible for the most serious violations of human rights in the Middle East. The United States has applied extraterritorial sanctions against it based on the Helms-Burton Act, just two weeks after it had supported with its vote the United States embargo on Cuba.

Another is a far-off republic where converted apparatchiks, in order to disguise their lack of industriousness in restoring their democracy, have sold the United States their uranium and their souls, in the hope that their corruption and despotism will be forgiven.

After exerting so much pressure on so many countries of the South, the delegation of the United States can be proud of having achieved the "dramatic" inclusion in this anti-Cuban exercise of precisely those who in the past had offered their territory for the Bay of Pigs invasion and who now rent their seat and their adjective-crammed speeches to the Miami mafia; of the accomplices in the dirty war against their own country; and of those who now betray their own people by restoring the privileges of criminals in one of this century's most brutal dictatorships.

Cuba takes pride in its democracy; like all democracies it is imperfect, but Cuba has found its own formulas to ensure for every Cuban without exception direct and full participation in the country's decisions. Cuba takes pride in having, and periodically electing, "a Government of the people, by the people and for the people".

What is actually being called into question today is the constitutional order which the Cuban people gave themselves in a referendum. The purpose is to show that the Cuban revolution is incompatible with so-called democratic values, with individual liberties and with political rights.

Cuba is proud of its socialist revolution, and the overwhelming majority of Cubans are ready to defend it with their blood. Cuba exists under the circumstances of an undeclared war waged from near its shores. The so-called dissident movement, purporting to be a legitimate opposition, is a fifth column made up of a mere handful of annexationists organized and financed by the United States. They are not political dissidents; they are vulgar mercenaries.

Cuba reiterates its willingness to cooperate and to engage in dialogue in this field. But it is also prepared for confrontation. Cuba enjoys full sovereignty; it is independent in its own right, and it owes an explanation only to its own people on how it votes at the United Nations. In defence of its sovereignty, its democracy and its people's human rights, Cuba will vote against this travesty.

Ms. Mohamed (Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Yemen has always taken a firm and well-defined position on draft resolutions transmitted by the Third Committee to the General Assembly on the human rights situation in specific States, and we shall continue to do so. Our decision not to participate in the voting on these draft resolutions is based on a strong conviction and clear understanding of all the complex factors that affect human rights, that violate fundamental freedoms, and that deprive human beings of the ability to enjoy their dignity, wherever they may be.

In principle, in its policies and in its civilization, Yemen attaches high priority in its decision-making and its practices to human rights at the local, regional and international levels. It seeks constantly to establish the appropriate political and economic environment and to create social conditions in which the theoretical and practical concepts of human rights can be translated into reality.

The development and democratic process proceeding progressively in Yemen is in total consonance with

international conventions, criteria and instruments. Successful attempts by my country to hold free and direct parliamentary elections, the participation of all sectors in them, the success of women in gaining parliamentary seats, and the other positive steps being taken at present to establish a free democratic and economic order all attest to our serious approach towards realizing human rights, so that all Yemeni citizens may exercise their rights and be enabled to actually enjoy their freedoms, and their freely chosen options in their society. Yemen is also constantly striving to broaden the network of education and training and granting the press and information media, in general, large freedom of expression and participation. Today, in Yemen, there are more than 100 newspapers and independent party publications. Moreover, there are more than 17 political parties and organizations. All these efforts are aimed ultimately at raising awareness, expanding education and bolstering economic and political security and stability, as well as effecting the basic and necessary changes that would enable the citizens of Yemen to breathe freely in an environment of freedom and dignity and thereby to exercise their human rights, which emerge in their fullness within their own environment, culture, local civilization and history, which define their own identity first and foremost as human beings.

Therefore, when Yemen chooses not to participate in the voting on human rights situations in various States, it does so on the basis of its strong belief in the importance of complete respect for the identity of the human being. Such an identity, in the final analysis, is the essence of man's being and existence.

Therefore, we will not participate in the voting and would like to explain and summarize our position as follows. First, politicization of human rights issues and their manipulation as a means of political coercion in order to realize economic, trade or other objectives are unacceptable. Secondly, to consider the human rights issue as a pretext for interference in others' internal affairs in order to spread hegemony over or effect the political dependence of a certain country or region is also unacceptable. Thirdly, fourthly and fifthly it is unacceptable to use a double standard in the application of rules, to adopt a selective approach in finding fault and to disregard the right to development or to understate its direct effect on human rights.

Finally, Yemen reiterates all the calls it made in the discussions of the Third Committee to the effect that it is better to conduct open dialogues among peoples than to resort to accusations and confrontation. We also believe it important to consider the essential reasons which open the door to human rights violations, such as poverty, ignorance and war.

In addition, we would like to call for the development of the approach used by the international community in adopting legislation and resolutions in the field of human rights, in order to enable everyone to participate. This would foster the feeling that there is a genuine desire for the protection of human rights, without bias.

My country's delegation will not participate in the voting on any of the draft resolutions now before us, with the exception of those adopted by consensus.

Mr. Al-Hitti (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): We have expressed our position clearly in the Third Committee with regard to the issue of human rights in general, and with regard to the draft resolution on the situation of human rights in Iraq in particular. We still hold the same position.

On the other hand, due to my country's inability to pay its contributions to the United Nations budget, as a result of the unjust economic embargo against Iraq, my country has been denied the right to vote, pursuant to Article 19 of the United Nations Charter. If we had the right to vote, we would vote against the draft resolutions on human rights situations in the Sudan, Cuba and Nigeria. This is because these are political draft resolutions that have nothing to do with human rights in those countries.

Mr. Gambari (Nigeria): From the outset, my delegation had queried the purpose and intent of the draft resolution entitled "Situation of human rights in Nigeria", contained in document A/52/644/Add.3, which the General Assembly is now considering. It is quite clear to us that the authors are intent on pursuing their political agenda by prescribing for the people of Nigeria the type of political system they must adopt and when to do so. It is their scheme to use this very important issue of human rights as a vehicle for blatant interference in the internal affairs of my country. We are convinced that genuine concern for the people of Nigeria is the least consideration in the minds of the authors of this draft resolution.

Incidentally, it is significant to note that the authors of the draft resolution on Nigeria are the same countries

which have just voted against or abstained in the voting on the draft resolution on the right to development.

The manner in which the draft resolution on the human rights situation in Nigeria was initiated and presented also leaves much to be desired. It was discussed in secrecy and was sprung as a surprise to our delegation in the Third Committee; it thus calls into question the credibility and, indeed, the very integrity of its authors.

This draft resolution also does a disservice to the genuine efforts at the global level towards the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms, in accordance with the principles of non-selectivity, objectivity and impartiality. The content of this draft resolution is not based on any report of any of the principal organs or offices of the United Nations system. It makes no such reference, because there is none for consideration at this session.

Beyond procedural and presentation issues, the provisions of the draft resolution reflect a deliberate attempt by the authors to misrepresent grossly the situation of human rights and the democratization process in Nigeria. If they had wanted to be objective, or if they had taken pains to know it as it is, they would have spared all of us the travesty which this draft resolution represents.

My delegation has outlined at every opportunity the concrete actions and steps taken by the Government of Nigeria towards ensuring the promotion and protection of human rights. I am proud to note again that we are one of the countries that have established an independent and fully functional National Human Rights Commission, which serves as a watchdog against any human rights abuses and provides an avenue for redress where any abuses may have occurred. Indeed, the Chairman and some members of the Commission will be making an official visit to the United Nations Headquarters here in New York next week to further explain the activities of the Commission, and we invite delegations to meet them. The legal system and our system of tribunals are constantly being looked at closely, and reviewed as necessary, in order to ensure that individuals are able to get free and fair trials in accordance with our laws and in accordance with relevant international standards.

Those familiar with the Nigerian judiciary will bear testimony to the fact that it is a highly professional and credible one, which has always upheld the rule of law and the defence of justice for all. The Nigerian press remains one of the most vibrant and free presses anywhere in the world. The sheer number of independent and privately owned newspapers and radio and television stations in Nigeria speaks for itself.

On the question of democratization, the Government of Nigeria in 1995 set out a carefully phased programme for transition to civil rule, with a terminal date of 1 October 1998. This is the year 1997, and the various stages in the transition programme are being implemented as set out in the timetable. Only last Saturday, 6 December 1997, legislative elections for state assemblies, which were contested by the five political parties, were held in the 36 states of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. The over 700 local government councils in Nigeria are today headed and administered by elected chairmen and councillors. I am happy to inform the Assembly that some of the elected officials at the local level joined their counterparts from all over the world to deliberate at the recently concluded World Conference of Mayors, held in Abuja, the federal capital of Nigeria.

The progress and achievements are there for anyone with an open mind to see. That is why, viewed against the backdrop of these concrete steps and efforts, the draft resolution before us on Nigeria is a gross misrepresentation of the actual situation in my country. The draft resolution is inappropriate, it is unfair and it is unbalanced. It is also prejudicial to the democratization process in Nigeria. That is why, at the Third Committee level, of the African countries — which, after all, are closest to the true situation in Nigeria — only three voted in support of the draft resolution. That is also why most Asian and Caribbean Member States did not support the draft resolution in the Third Committee. And that is why my delegation will again vote against this draft resolution. We urge all well-meaning members of this Assembly and true friends of Nigeria to join us in voting against it in this plenary meeting.

The President: The Assembly has before it 11 draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 44 of part IV of its report, and the draft decision recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 45 of the same report.

I shall put the 11 draft resolutions and the draft decision to the Assembly one by one. After all decisions have been taken, representatives will again have the opportunity to explain their votes.

We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled "Situation of human rights in Myanmar".

The Third Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 52/137).

The President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Human rights in Haiti".

The Third Committee adopted draft resolution II without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 52/138).

The President: We turn now to draft resolution III, entitled "Situation of human rights in Kosovo".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Comoros, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu

Against:

India, Russian Federation

Abstaining:

Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Belarus, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Israel, Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Malawi, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Singapore, Slovakia, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution III was adopted by 106 votes to 2, with 56 abstentions (resolution 52/139).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Swaziland informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

The President: We turn now to draft resolution IV, entitled "Situation of human rights in the Sudan".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda,

Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Zimbabwe

Against:

Afghanistan, China, Comoros, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Viet Nam

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines. Republic of Korea, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 93 votes to 16, with 58 abstentions (resolution 52/140).

The President: Draft resolution V is entitled "Situation of human rights in Iraq".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Zambia

Against:

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nigeria, Sudan

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Saint Lucia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution V was adopted by 99 votes to 3, with 60 abstentions (resolution 52/141).

The President: We turn now to draft resolution VI, entitled "Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica,

Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Zambia

Against:

Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, China, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Myanmar, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Albania, Angola, Bahrain, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Fiji, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania

Draft resolution VI was adopted by 74 votes to 32, with 56 abstentions (resolution 52/142).

The President: We now turn to draft resolution VII, entitled "Situation of human rights in Cuba".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu

Against:

Angola, Belarus, Benin, Burundi, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Myanmar, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, South Africa, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Oman, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela

Draft resolution VII was adopted by 64 votes to 29, with 75 abstentions (resolution 52/143).

The President: Draft resolution VIII is entitled "Situation of human rights in Nigeria".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Zimbabwe

Against:

Benin, Chad, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Equatorial Guinea, Ghana, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Myanmar, Niger, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominica, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zambia

Draft resolution VIII was adopted by 81 votes to 18, with 64 abstentions (resolution 52/144).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Swaziland informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

The President: Draft resolution IX is entitled "Situation of human rights in Afghanistan".

The Third Committee adopted draft resolution IX without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IX was adopted (resolution 52/145).

The President: Draft resolution X is entitled "Situation of human rights in Rwanda".

The Third Committee adopted draft resolution X without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution X was adopted (resolution 52/146).

The President: Draft resolution XI is entitled "Situation of human rights in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait,

Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela

Against:

Belarus, Russian Federation

Abstaining:

Angola, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, India, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Namibia, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution XI was adopted by 133 votes to 2, with 27 abstentions (resolution 52/147).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Mali informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

The President: We turn now to the draft decision recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 45 of part IV of the report.

The Third Committee adopted the draft decision, entitled "Documents considered by the General Assembly in connection with human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives", without a vote.

May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft decision was adopted.

The President: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to make statements in explanation of vote.

Mr. Mukhopadhaya (India): My delegation has asked for the floor to make an explanation of vote on draft resolution III, entitled "Situation of human rights in Kosovo", contained in document A/52/644/Add.3, transmitting the report of the Third Committee on agenda item 112 (c), "Human rights questions: human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives".

India is committed to the promotion and protection of all human rights everywhere in the world. India is also committed to the preservation and protection of the territorial integrity, national sovereignty and independence of Member States of the United Nations. India also firmly adheres to the Charter principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of Member States. Furthermore, as a country of many languages and faiths that is committed to pluralism, India is firmly committed to the promotion and protection of the rights of all minorities within the framework of the unity and territorial integrity of Member States.

Nevertheless, my delegation was compelled to vote against the resolution because it is perhaps the only resolution under this agenda item whose title refers to one part of a sovereign country as though that part of the country were not an integral part of the country concerned. It could therefore be seen as inconsistent with Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

It also seems to deviate from the principles of non-selectivity and indivisibility of human rights by appearing to view the situation in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in bits and parts, through a single ethnic prism. Moreover, since there is already a resolution on the situation of human rights in the Former Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) — as part of an omnibus resolution that also covers the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Republic of Croatia — the right place to address the situation of human rights in Kosovo would appear to be in the context of that resolution.

For the reason outlined above, we were obliged to vote against the draft resolution.

My delegation also wishes to take this opportunity to make a brief explanation of position on preambular

paragraph 7 of draft resolution XI of the same document, "Situation of human rights in the territories of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)".

With reference to the Special Rapporteur's observations on the death penalty, including the call for the abolition of the death penalty, contained in paragraph 36 of the report in document A/52/490, we would like to underline that there are two views on whether the death penalty is compatible with international law or not. Those who have acceded to the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights have undertaken to abolish capital punishment in their penal codes. The other view sees it as a legitimate penal provision within the competence of national legislation and provided for under article 6, paragraph 2, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights to deal with

> "the most serious crimes in accordance with the law in force at the time of the commission of the crime".

Given this divergence of positions and provisions, it cannot be asserted that the death penalty is incompatible with applicable international law.

Mrs. Cornette (Guyana): My delegation takes the floor in explanation of vote after the voting with regard to draft resolutions VI and XI of document A/52/644/Add.3.

While our delegation voted in favour of draft resolution VI, entitled "Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran", we would like to place on record our reservations regarding operative paragraph 4 (g), which calls for the regulation of capital punishment.

Capital punishment is an intrinsic part of the Guyanese legal system. Consequently, my delegation cannot accept within this resolution attempts to impose conditions on the use of capital punishment by States. The language of operative paragraph 4 (g) seeks to define in broad and sweeping terms the nature of crimes for which capital punishment may be prescribed and to set limitations for its use. Since there exists no international consensus on the abolition of capital punishment, my delegation is concerned that the wording in this paragraph can be construed as an attempt to undermine internal judicial laws. We believe that it is the sovereign right of each State to implement a legal system which it deems appropriate and effective for its own particular circumstances.

Further, Guyana supported draft resolution XI, entitled "Situation of human rights in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)". However, we would like to express our reservations on the seventh preambular paragraph, which refers to

> "the reports and recommendations of the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights on the situation of human rights in the territories of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)".

In this report, the Special Rapporteur deals with the issue of capital punishment and ultimately calls for the abolition of the death penalty. Guyana's objections to this are twofold. First of all, capital punishment is applied in Guyana and is considered a legitimate part of the State's judicial system. Moreover, since there exists no international consensus on the abolition of capital punishment, we cannot support the Rapporteur's statement in this regard.

We would like to request that these comments be recorded in the official records.

Mr. Myaing (Myanmar): My delegation voted against draft resolution VI, entitled "Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran" in the Committee and has continued to maintain that position at this plenary meeting. The reason we requested the floor today is to bring the attention of the Assembly to operative paragraph 4 (g), which is connected with the issue of capital punishment. The language used therein is in contravention of that of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Furthermore, no international consensus has yet been reached to abolish capital punishment. The inclusion of such a paragraph in the draft resolution is of concern to our delegation.

Mr. Rodríguez San Martín (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly has taken a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Situation of human rights in Cuba", which expresses the international community's concern at the situation regarding fundamental freedoms in Cuba, on the basis of the report submitted by the Special Rapporteur. The Bolivian delegation voted in favour of this draft resolution because we are convinced that the full and effective enjoyment of human rights is a basic condition for development. We

believe that participatory and representative democracy is the way to achieve sustainable development and stability for peoples. Respect for human rights is part and parcel of a democratic system, which is why the promotion and protection of human rights concerns us all.

Mr. Xie Bohua (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): I would like to make the following statement regarding our position under agenda item 112 (c) on draft resolution III, "Situation of human rights in Kosovo".

Respect for State sovereignty and territorial integrity is an important principle of the Charter of the United Nations. On the basis of this principle, the delegation of China is never in favour of consideration, under the agenda item on human rights in individual countries, of issues relating to an area that falls within the territory of one country. We believe that Kosovo is part of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which is a sovereign country whose sovereignty and territorial integrity should be respected.

On the basis of that consideration, the delegation of China could not support the draft resolution on the situation of human rights in Kosovo that has just been adopted. Therefore, we abstained in the voting.

Ms. Foo (Singapore): When the draft resolution on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran was acted on in the Third Committee, a total of 10 delegations placed on record their reservations on the statement on capital punishment contained in operative paragraph 4 (g). Today, a further three delegations have also recorded their reservations on the paragraph which is now contained in draft resolution VI in document A/52/644/Add.3. These 13 delegations had different voting positions on the resolution as a whole. However, all agreed that the language of operative paragraph 4 (g), in attempting to dictate what crimes should or should not be punished by the death penalty, was sweeping and intrusive and, indeed, out of line with general international law.

Article 6, paragraph 2, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights explicitly permits capital punishment for

> "the most serious crimes in accordance with the law in force at the time of the commission of the crime".

It does not single out any particular crime. Even the Special Representative of the Commission on Human Rights on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, in referring to the use of the death penalty in the country, did not make any value judgement on what crimes could or could not be penalized by capital punishment.

My delegation would like to reiterate its objection to operative paragraph 4 (g).

My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution "Situation of human rights in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)" in the Third Committee on 26 November 1997. We have done so again today in the plenary. In supporting the resolution, however, my delegation would like to reiterate, for the record, our reservations on the seventh preambular paragraph of a resolution that was before the Assembly as draft resolution XI in document A/52/644/Add.3.

The seventh preambular paragraph makes reference to the Special Rapporteur's report, contained in document A/52/490, which, *inter alia,* claims that the death penalty is incompatible with applicable international law. The Special Rapporteur's comments on the death penalty clearly exceed her mandate. Her claim that the death penalty is incompatible with international law is patently wrong.

Representatives to the Third Committee will recall that when this draft resolution was taken up for action on 26 November 1997, a total of 22 countries expressed similar reservations, either in explanations of vote or in general statements, with regard to the Special Rapporteur's comments on the death penalty. A further three delegations have expressed reservations today in the plenary.

It is hoped that the General Assembly will take due note of the reservations expressed by the 25 delegations which have spoken out on this issue. It is clear that there is no international consensus on the abolition of capital punishment.

Mr. Dlamini (Swaziland): First, on the question of human rights in Nigeria, our position is that we abstain, as it was in the Third Committee.

Still on the subject of Nigeria, our belief that we should abstain emanates from the fact that a lot of good is being done in Nigeria. Even the report or communiqué of the Commonwealth summit of Heads of State indicated

that a lot of good is being done in Nigeria. The elections which have recently taken place at the state level are also indicative of all the good that is being done in Nigeria.

My delegation therefore believes that before adopting or drafting resolutions, those who are keen to do so should first embark upon a deeper study of a country to see if there have been any improvements or not. Let us, as delegations, avoid drafting resolutions routinely, because doing so would mean that we are not exercising justice at all, except to act on grudges.

On the Sudan, we abstained, on the principle that the resolution being debated here fails to acknowledge all the efforts that have been exhibited in the Sudan.

We also abstained on Iran, because we believe that the Government of Iran is doing a lot of good and is moving in a good direction.

On the question of capital punishment, my country and many developing countries still have capital punishment statutes, like many countries in the "supreme" world.

On Kosovo, our position is that we abstain, because we believe that the national integrity of a State should be respected.

Mr. Choe Myong Nam (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): My delegation voted against the draft resolutions on the human rights situations in various countries, including the Islamic Republic of Iran. My delegation does not agree with the manner in which the human rights situations of those countries are handled.

My delegation has always maintained its position that a politicized approach to the human rights issue cannot in any way contribute to international cooperation in the field of human rights.

In addition, I would like to put on record my delegation's reservations on operative paragraph 4 (g) of resolution VI, on the human rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran, concerning the death penalty. My delegation believes that the decision as to whether to maintain or abolish the death penalty is a matter of the sovereign rights of individual States.

Mr. Ndiaye (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution entitled "Situation of human rights in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)" when it was submitted to the Third Committee.

My delegation has just voted in favour of this text again, but wishes to express its reservations on the seventh preambular paragraph, which refers to the comments of the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights, whose mandate was to study the situation of human rights in the territories of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

The Rapporteur made several comments, in particular on capital punishment, which is still part of our national legislation and on which there is not yet an international consensus, so my delegation would like to put this statement on the record.

Mrs. Castro de Barish (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Costa Rica co-sponsored draft resolution XI, on the situation of human rights in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro). We wish to reiterate our support for the seventh preambular paragraph, which refers to the reports of the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights concerning the human rights situation in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), and, in particular, for her most recent report, of 17 October 1997, as well as for her comments on capital punishment.

This is because Costa Rica is a party to the Additional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. We believe that the Covenant is a fully legitimate and valid part of international law. It is clear that the Protocol is optional and therefore is binding only on those States parties that have adopted it.

Costa Rica is a party to the Protocol, and we abolished capital punishment more than 100 years ago. This happened because of the sensitivity of a woman, the wife of the President of the Republic, Doña Emilia Solórzano de Guardia, who urged her husband to submit a draft bill to Costa Rica's Legislative Assembly to that end. After a lengthy debate, the bill was adopted. Years later, the Legislative Assembly of Costa Rica declared Doña Emilia an honoured daughter of the country.

The President: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote after the voting.

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (c) of agenda item 112?

It was so decided.

(d) Comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

Report of the Third Committee (Part V) (A/52/644/Add.4)

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 11 of Part V of its report (A/52/644/Add.4) and on the draft decision recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 12 of the same report.

We turn first to the draft resolution, entitled "Comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action", which the Third Committee adopted without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 52/148).

The President: We turn now to the draft decision, entitled "Working Group of the Third Committee".

May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt the draft decision recommended by the Third Committee?

The draft decision was adopted.

The President: We have thus concluded this stage of our consideration of sub-item (d) of agenda item 112.

(e) Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

Report of the Third Committee (Part VI) (A/52/644/Add.5)

The President: The Assembly will now consider Part VI of the report of the Third Committee.

May I take it that the Assembly takes note of Part VI of the report?

It was so decided.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (e) of agenda item 112?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 12 *(continued)*

Report of the Economic and Social Council

Report of the Third Committee (A/52/633)

Draft resolution (A/52/L.66)

The President: I call upon the representative of Denmark to introduce draft resolution A/52/L.66.

Mr. Bøjer (Denmark): I almost feel I should apologize to you, Mr. President, and to my colleagues — and perhaps in particular my colleague from Swaziland — for prolonging our proceedings at the end of a long day and a long week. However, this issue is important, and the purpose is one we all share.

I am therefore not apologetic but pleased to introduce draft resolution A/52/L.66, entitled "United Nations International Day in Support of Victims of Torture". This draft resolution is wholly procedural and limited in scope and substance to Economic and Social Council decision 1997/251, by which the Economic and Social Council approved by consensus the request of the Commission on Human Rights to the General Assembly, in preparing for the fiftieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to proclaim 26 June United Nations International Day in Support of Victims of Torture, with a view to the total eradication of torture and the effective functioning of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

Since the agenda for the Third Committee this year does not include a specific item on torture, and owing to the fact that Economic and Social Council decision 1997/251 has not been expressly endorsed but merely taken note of in the report of the Third Committee, Denmark has decided to present this draft resolution in the plenary of the Assembly. You may ask, "Why

Denmark?" Simply because Denmark was the originator of Commission on Human Rights resolution 1997/38, which was adopted without a vote. It is my sincere hope that the present draft resolution can also be adopted without a vote.

The President: The Assembly will first take a decision on the two draft decisions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 9 of its report (A/52/633).

We turn first to draft decision I, entitled "Organization of work of the Third Committee and draft biennial programme of work of the Committee for 1998-1999".

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt draft decision I?

Draft decision I was adopted.

The President: We turn next to draft decision II, entitled "Report of the Economic and Social Council".

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt draft decision II?

Draft decision II was adopted.

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/52/L.66, "United Nations International Day in Support of Victims of Torture," just introduced by the representative of Denmark.

May I take it that the Assembly decides to adopt draft resolution A/52/L.66?

Draft resolution A/52/L.66 was adopted (resolution 52/149).

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of the chapters of the report of the Economic and Social Council allocated to the Third Committee?

It was so decided.

The President: The General Assembly has thus concluded its consideration of all the reports of the Third Committee. I should like to thank the Third Committee and its Chairman and other officers for the timely conclusion of the Committee's work and activities, despite the great number of very important issues that the Committee considered.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.

United Nations A/52/PV.71

General Assembly
Fifty-second Session

Official Records

71st plenary meeting
Monday, 15 December 1997, 10 a.m.
New York

President: Mr. Udovenko ..... (Ukraine)

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

Agenda item 17 (*continued*)

Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments

(h) Appointment of the members of the Consultative Committee on the United Nations Development Fund for Women

The President: The terms of office of the present five members of the Consultative Committee appointed under General Assembly decisions 49/317 A and B of 5 and 16 December 1994, respectively, expire on 31 December 1997.

Following consultations, I have appointed Austria, the Bahamas, Romania, Thailand and Uganda as members of the Consultative Committee for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1998.

May I consider that the General Assembly takes note of these appointments?

It was so decided.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (h) of agenda item 17?

It was so decided.

(i) Appointment of members of the Committee on Conferences

Note by the Secretary-General (A/52/109)

The President: As indicated in document A/52/109, since the terms of office of the Bahamas, Belgium, Ghana, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Latvia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Senegal expire on 31 December 1997, it is necessary for the President of the General Assembly to appoint, during the current session, seven members to fill the resulting vacancies. The members so appointed will serve for a period of three years beginning on 1 January 1998.

After consultations with the Chairmen of the Groups of African States, Asian States, Eastern European States, Latin American and Caribbean States and Western European and other States, I have appointed Argentina, the Bahamas, Belgium, Benin, Georgia, the Islamic Republic of Iran and Lesotho as members of the Committee on Conferences, with effect from 1 January 1998.

May I take it that the Assembly takes note of these appointments?

It was so decided.

97-86740 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one month of the date of the meeting*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

The President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (i) of agenda item 17?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 47

The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Draft resolution A/52/L.67/Rev.1

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Slovenia to introduce draft resolution A/52/L.67/Rev.1.

Mr. Türk (Slovenia): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution on agenda item 47, entitled "The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina", contained in document A/52/L.67/Rev.1. In addition to the sponsors listed in the draft, the following countries joined as sponsors after its formal completion: Austria, the Netherlands and Kuwait.

The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina continues to be a matter of international interest and concern. While important progress has been made in the implementation of the Dayton/Paris Peace Agreement, it is obvious that further international efforts are needed. The draft resolution submitted to the General Assembly today addresses the most important among them.

The last two years have brought significant change to Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Dayton/Paris Peace Agreement and the international action for its implementation have stopped the war and preserved the independence, sovereignty, legal continuity and territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina within its internationally recognized borders.

The Peace Agreement represented a significant achievement and an important contribution to the maintenance of international peace and security. The implementation of certain aspects of it, such as the establishment of a lasting cessation of hostilities, the progress made in the implementation of articles II and IV of the Agreement on Regional Stabilization, and the successful holding of municipal elections on 13 and 14 September 1997 throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina, have further contributed to the international stability and security in the region. The efforts of the High Representative in the implementation of the peace process have gained wide international recognition and support.

Among recent events, it is necessary to emphasize the importance of the meeting of the Peace Implementation Council held in Bonn on 9 and 10 December 1997. The Council reviewed progress in the implementation of the Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina since the Peace Implementation Conference in London on 4 and 5 December 1996 and the Ministerial Meeting of the Peace Implementation Council Steering Board in Sintra, Portugal, in May 1997.

At its recent meeting in Bonn, the Peace Implementation Council confirmed that there is no alternative to the Peace Agreement as the foundation for the political and economic development of Bosnia and Herzegovina, its two multi-ethnic entities and its three constituent peoples. It reconfirmed the commitment of the international community to continue to strengthen and support the efforts for reconciliation, tolerance and democracy as well as for economic and social development in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The vital contribution of the multinational Stabilization Force in providing a secure environment for the implementation of the Peace Agreement has been generally recognized, and it is particularly important that the conclusions of the Bonn Peace Implementation Conference confirmed an emerging consensus on the need for an international military presence to continue beyond June 1998. This remains indispensable for the maintenance of a stable security environment necessary for the implementation of civilian aspects of the Peace Agreement.

Draft resolution A/52/L.67/Rev.1 addresses all these aspects of the peace process in Bosnia and Herzegovina and expresses support for the efforts to establish peace and stability in Bosnia and Herzegovina and throughout the region. Moreover, the draft places a special emphasis on those aspects of the peace process which require further international efforts. In particular, it notes the content of the fourth annual report of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991. That report describes the uneven degrees of compliance by the different parties, a problem which continues to give rise to serious concern.

In this context, the draft resolution notes the conclusions of the Bonn Peace Implementation Conference, which state that all persons indicted for war crimes must be handed over to the Tribunal for justice to

be dispensed impartially, under the terms of the Peace Agreement and Security Council resolutions. Furthermore, the conclusions of the Peace Implementation Conference referred to in the draft resolution draw particular attention to the failure to carry out this obligation by the authorities of Republika Srpska and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. It is the obligation of all the parties to hand over to the Tribunal all indicted persons in territories under their control and to otherwise comply with the orders of the Tribunal and to cooperate with the Tribunal. The draft welcomes the efforts to secure compliance with the orders of the Tribunal, consistent with the Security Council mandate.

Another important aspect of the peace process in Bosnia concerns the return of refugees and freedom of movement. The right of refugees and displaced persons to return voluntarily to their homes is strongly reaffirmed in the draft resolution. All the parties are called upon to establish the conditions necessary for the return of refugees and displaced persons. The acts of intimidation and violence and the killings, including those designed to discourage the voluntary return of refugees, are strongly condemned.

The draft also addresses a number of other issues of the implementation of peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina, including the obligation of both the entities to cooperate fully with the Supervisor for Brcko. It notes that the conclusions of the Bonn Peace Implementation Conference stated that the outcome of the Arbitration Award in March 1998 would be significantly affected by the degree of compliance shown by the parties.

Finally, the draft stresses the importance of economic revitalization and reconstruction for the successful consolidation of peace, and commends the efforts of a large number of international organizations, international financial institutions and non-governmental organizations for their roles in the implementation of the Peace Agreement.

In a forward-looking manner, the draft resolution emphasises the importance of the efforts to ensure respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the right to freedom of opinion and expression, which has to be respected and ensured in all parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Furthermore, it stresses the importance of democratization and the holding of elections throughout the country, and calls upon all parties to cooperate fully and in good faith in ensuring substantial functioning of all the common institutions of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in accordance with the Peace Agreement.

The content of the draft resolution reflects both the urgency and the universality of concern for the implementation of peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina. As a problem of universal concern, the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina continues to call for the attention of the General Assembly, the most representative body of the international community. Many delegations participated in the preparation of the present draft resolution. We are grateful for their input and for the wide support already expressed. We hope that the draft resolution will therefore be adopted by consensus.

Mr. Sacirbey (Bosnia and Herzegovina): My delegation will be able neither to co-sponsor nor to vote in favour of the draft resolution before us. But that is exactly why the Assembly should support the draft resolution regarding the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The draft resolution makes a positive contribution to the peace process in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It strives to achieve consensus both among the delegations here at the United Nations and within my Government in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Unfortunately, some who formally hold positions of power within my Government may lack genuine commitment to the peace process and the State which they are sworn to serve. In fact, some may be using their official positions and legitimacy to undermine the Dayton/Paris Peace Agreement and the State of Bosnia itself.

This morning I spoke with my Minister, Mr. Jadranko Prlić, and he gave his full support for our co-sponsorship of the draft resolution. Unfortunately, while two parties are prepared to co-sponsor and fully support, one is not.

As a consequence, we find ourselves in a strange Hamlet-like dilemma: to co-sponsor or not to co-sponsor. For now, we will not co-sponsor, especially without a consensus within our own central Government. We will not be accused of undermining the central institutions of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and thus unwittingly contributing to the very process which we criticize here. This is exactly why the Assembly must send the message that it will do its utmost to support the draft resolution and thereby support the development of the peace process and the State. Otherwise, the lack of support here, and the blockage and obstruction of our institutions from

within, will result in the non-existence of the State of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

A State cannot for ever advance and survive on the basis of formality receiving priority over substance. Unfortunately, that is our situation now. My delegation's commitment to the formalities of our institutions will hopefully give the State and all our leadership the time and the opportunity to translate this into the real functioning of such institutions for the benefit of all Bosnians, their State and the peace process. In the meantime, through the Assembly's support for the draft resolution, the substance of peace will be promoted.

The draft resolution, frankly, is nothing controversial. It is completely in accordance with the Peace Agreement, relevant Security Council resolutions, Bosnia's Constitution and the recently concluded Peace Implementation Conference held in Bonn, Germany. The draft resolution on this subject is important because, once a year, it gives the General Assembly — the entire membership of the United Nations — the opportunity to voice views on this matter that is important not only for us but also for regional and global security and the credibility and image of the United Nations.

In addition, and unfortunately, my delegation will not be able to vote in favour of the draft resolution if it is brought to a vote because there has not as yet been a consensus within my Government to pay our past assessment and dues to the Organization. Unfortunately, our membership in this institution, one of the most visible signs of our sovereignty and survival, is also being obstructed.

We will overcome.

Thanks to the Assembly's support today, the job will be made more manageable.

Let me here take the opportunity to thank all of the sponsors and those voting in favour. Ambassador Danilo Türk's leadership and commitment of time is especially appreciated.

Mr. Wolzfeld (Luxembourg) *(interpretation from French)*: I have the honour to speak today on behalf of the European Union concerning the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, under agenda item 47. The countries of Central and Eastern Europe associated with the European Union — namely, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Romania and Slovakia — as well as Iceland and Norway, associate themselves with this statement.

The European Union wishes first of all to thank the High Representative for the relentless efforts he and his team have devoted over many months, and often under difficult conditions, to assisting in the establishment of a lasting peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Union would also like to express its gratitude to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the members of the International Police Task Force, the members of the United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina — in particular those of the Stabilization Force — the specialized agencies of the United Nations and the other international and non-governmental organizations for the services they have rendered for the cause of peace and reconciliation in that country. Finally, the European Union pays tribute to the victims of the conflict and to all those who died discharging their duties in the service of peace on behalf of the international community.

The European Union recalls that there is no alternative to the Peace Agreement as the foundation for the political and economic development of Bosnia and Herzegovina and its two multi-ethnic entities. The process initiated two years ago has been characterized by the fact that the military section of the agreements has been implemented. Furthermore, the international community has launched a substantial effort to rebuild infrastructure in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

While 1997 has seen real progress, further efforts will still have to be made in such diverse areas as the re-establishment of security, the indictment of those responsible for war crimes, the establishment of a free media, the return of refugees and displaced persons, economic rehabilitation and the holding of local elections. It is true that these results will remain fragile if further progress in the fields of common institutions and the economy is not made soon.

Much more could have been achieved had the authorities in Bosnia and Herzegovina fully contributed to the construction of a civic and democratic society in the country. As we enter the third year of implementation of the Peace Agreement and the last phase of the consolidation period, major efforts are still needed to ensure the functioning of viable structures in Bosnia and Herzegovina and its two entities. The democratization process, suitable protection of human rights, the rule of law, the establishment of a market economy and the

unhindered return of refugees and displaced persons, especially in regions where they were members of minority groups, continue to be of serious concern for the European Union.

The survival of a State depends essentially on the effective functioning of its institutions. The European Union hopes that those in charge in the central authorities and the entities, whether Bosnian, Croat or Serb, will cooperate fully with each other and with the international community.

In recent months the Republika Srpska has been going through a regrettable political crisis. The legislative elections held on 22 and 23 November this year should give the institutions of this entity a chance to make a fresh start towards a policy of cooperation in the framework of the peace process.

General elections are due to be held in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1998. The OSCE must play a role in these elections, which will mark a new and important stage in the country's democratization process. Further efforts are needed to establish a permanent electoral system.

To this end, the reform of the media must be completed so that they can operate in a democratic and pluralist manner. Finally, the multi-ethnicity of the parties needs to be developed.

The European Union is concerned by the fact that the central Government in Bosnia and Herzegovina operates without any organic law, secretariat or fixed headquarters. The Assembly has met only five times since its election last year. The central budget is not funded by the entities, which withhold customs revenues or do not collect them. Large sums are being managed without the necessary transparency and outside the legal process. Bosnia and Herzegovina still has neither a flag nor a common currency.

The European Union wishes to reaffirm that it will not tolerate attempts within the entities to undermine the sovereignty of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Nor will it tolerate attempts by any group to dominate the political institutions in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

We call on all parties to work together to ensure full respect for the Constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina and in particular to ensure that governmental structures at all levels become fully operational.

The return of the refugees and displaced persons remains a priority. Although freedom of movement between and within the entities has improved, much remains to be done to guarantee the free circulation of people and goods in the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina. A very large number of refugees have still not returned home for fear of acts of intimidation and violence. Measures must be taken immediately to put an end to such acts. Furthermore, urgent administrative and legal measures must be taken by all parties concerned to allow the return of refugees and displaced persons, including to areas where they were members of minority groups, and their reintegration into their community of origin in conditions of safety and dignity, including full observance of their property rights.

The European Union reaffirms that full respect for human rights and the rights of minorities is closely linked to the restoration of a truly multi-ethnic Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Moreover, we fully support the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, which continues to be an essential tool for national reconciliation once persons responsible for war crimes have been arrested and sentenced. Although there has been some progress in terms of cooperation with the Tribunal, it is still not enough. The European Union recalls that as long as persons who have been indicted are not handed over to the International Tribunal, the prerequisites for reconciliation and the rule of law in Bosnia and Herzegovina will not be met.

The European Union would like to remind neighbouring countries of their obligations under the Peace Agreement. These obligations must be met in full, voluntarily and immediately.

The Peace Implementation Council met at Bonn on 9 and 10 December this year to study progress since the London Conference of 4 and 5 December 1996 and the Sintra Ministerial Meeting on 30 May 1997. The European Union welcomes the convening of the Bonn Conference and fully supports its conclusions. The European Union hopes that the impetus provided by that Conference will be decisive for the peace process and that it will be complemented by the full cooperation of all parties concerned.

We also support the High Representative in the difficult discharge of his duties. His work, as well as that of the international community, remains indispensable in

the foreseeable future. Our ultimate aim is still to see Bosnia and Herzegovina with an impartial administration and finally able to govern itself and to live within borders respected by its neighbours.

The European Union recalls that in Sintra and Bonn, the High Representative was given the task of ensuring observance of the deadlines for the implementation of specific obligations and that of taking measures in the event of failure to respect those obligations. The European Union welcomes the intention of the High Representative to make full use of his authority to ensure progress in achieving these goals.

We have indicated on several occasions, and at the highest level, our determination to contribute by all available means to the consolidation of peace and stability in the region. The European Union is in a position to make a special contribution to the process of stabilization and economic renewal by encouraging the development of relations with all countries of the region in a framework that is conducive to democracy, the rule of law, high standards of human and minority rights and a transition to a market economy. The establishment of an economy based on free trade will enable Bosnia and Herzegovina to reduce its dependence on international aid.

In the framework of its regional aid, the European Union recalls that the continuation of international assistance is linked to full respect by the authorities of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the neighbouring States for the Peace Agreement and their obligations under it.

Peace is not merely the absence of war. In the interest of future generations, lasting peace must be rebuilt, above all, in people's minds. The desire for national reconciliation in a spirit of justice and respect for law must be made to prevail over the thirst for revenge and narrow sectarianism. Such is the task awaiting all those who are devoting themselves to the delicate and constantly threatened task of restoring peace and reconciliation in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Mr. Takasu (Japan): Two years have passed since the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina was signed. During this period the ceasefire has been firmly maintained, due primarily to the presence of the Stabilization Force. The citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina have to a certain degree resumed their everyday lives, thanks in large part to the assistance provided by the international community.

While Japan appreciates these positive factors and developments, we cannot but recognize that progress in the implementation of the Peace Agreement, particularly in its civilian aspects, has not kept pace with the expectations of the international community, or, for that matter, those of the citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina themselves. The common institutions that are supposed to govern Bosnia and Herzegovina as a single State have been formally established, but they are not yet functioning as initially envisaged due to various impediments set up by one party or another.

We are aware, of course, that a desire for renewed multi-ethnic coexistence and inter-ethnic cooperation has been increasing among the citizens. Regrettably, however, the behaviour of the leaders of the three main ethnic groups and of the two entities has tended to thwart, rather than encourage, that desire.

Indeed, Japan is concerned that neither entity has demonstrated through concrete actions sufficient commitment to ethnic reconciliation and the rebuilding of a multi-ethnic society. The Serb leaders show separatist inclinations, remaining uncooperative with regard to the apprehension of war-crime suspects, media reform and several other crucial issues. My delegation calls upon them to provide concrete proof of their commitment to the peace process.

The Croat leaders also display separatist tendencies from time to time, as in their non-compliance with the results of the municipal elections in Mostar and Žepče. We call upon them to reaffirm their commitment not only to preserve but to vitalize the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

As for the Bosniac leaders, my delegation urges them to cooperate in sharing power under the central authorities with the other ethnic groups in order to facilitate the functioning of common institutions.

I should like to emphasize in this regard the importance of the conclusions of the Peace Implementation Conference held in Bonn on 9 and 10 December. All the parties in Bosnia and Herzegovina must make maximum efforts to fulfil their obligations, as outlined in those conclusions, so as to substantially expedite the peace process. My delegation wishes to stress that primary responsibility for the peace process lies with the parties in Bosnia and Herzegovina themselves. International support depends upon

cooperation and actions by the parties on the ground to advance that process.

I should like to conclude my remarks by expressing the Government of Japan's deep appreciation to all the countries and international institutions that are engaged in the noble and difficult tasks, both civilian and military, that are required for the implementation of the Peace Agreement. In particular, I wish to pay tribute to the High Representative, Mr. Carlos Westendorp, as well as to the Stabilization Force, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina, including the International Police Task Force. Truly, the services they are rendering in Bosnia and Herzegovina are services rendered to the international community as a whole.

Mr. Narzuki (Malaysia): My delegation is gratified that progress continues to be made towards consolidating peace and stability in Bosnia and Herzegovina through the implementation of the Dayton Peace Agreement. During the past 12 months many important achievements have been made. Armed hostilities have ceased and peace is holding ground. The implementation of the military aspects of the peace accords has been successful in large part because of the strong presence of the multinational forces. This in turn has made possible the implementation of the action plan for the civilian consolidation period agreed to at the London ministerial meeting in December 1996 and in the Sintra Declaration last May. Efforts towards building a unified, multi-ethnic, multicultural and multireligious Bosnia and Herzegovina within its internationally recognized boundaries have begun to take root, however slowly. Important common State institutions, such as the national Parliament, the joint Presidency and the Council of Ministers have been formed, and the results of the last municipal elections should lead to new ethnic alliances in many municipal assemblies.

Despite these achievements, the peace process in Bosnia and Herzegovina remains fragile and fraught with difficulties. Obstacles continue to impede the full implementation of the Dayton Peace Agreement. Mutual mistrust and animosity among the different ethnic groups continue to obstruct efforts towards achieving the ultimate goal of making peace irreversible. The Bosnian entities must realize that there is no viable alternative to the Peace Agreement as the foundation for building lasting peace and prosperity in a multi-ethnic Bosnia and Herzegovina. At the same time, the establishment of common State institutions is fundamental in ensuring a stable and functional Government. Although some of these common institutions have been established, their effective functioning has been impeded by the frequent absence of the Serb members. It is imperative that all the concerned parties honour their commitment to ensure that all joint State institutions are duly constituted and able to function efficiently and effectively and enjoy the support and confidence of the three constituent peoples. No attempts should be made to erode the powers and responsibilities of the State.

Malaysia believes that the consolidation of peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina is contingent upon the presence of a safe and secure environment, freedom of movement and the respect for basic human rights and fundamental freedoms. All citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina should be free to move anywhere in the country, without fear of harassment or intimidation. Refugees and displaced persons must be allowed to return freely to their homes in safety and dignity. We are concerned that only a quarter of the estimated 2 million refugees and displaced persons have returned to Bosnia and Herzegovina, mostly to areas in which they belong to the ethnic majority. Returns of minority members have been disappointingly limited due to continued political, security and administrative obstacles. We call upon all concerned to ensure that Bosnian displaced persons are able return to their homes without fear and that their human rights are respected and upheld. This is critical to the revival of the State of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the success of the democratization process.

The attainment of a lasting peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina must be based on the rule of law and the meting out of full justice. In this regard, the perpetrators of crimes against humanity committed in Bosnia and Herzegovina must be held accountable for their past actions before the International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, in The Hague.

The victims of genocide and "ethnic cleansing" should not be denied justice. We are, however, concerned that many of the indicted war criminals, including Radovan Karadžić and Ratko Mladić, are still at large and free to carry out their activities with impunity. More disturbing is the fact that Karadžić and Mladic continue to exercise political influence in the Serb entity. Their continued freedom constitutes a major hindrance to the creation of a unified Bosnia and Herzegovina. We therefore demand their immediate arrest and trial. The role of the multinational forces is crucial in ensuring their arrest. In this respect, we wish to commend the courageous efforts of the British forces

in apprehending an indicted war criminal in the Serb territory last July. Such cooperation between the Stabilization Force and the Tribunal should be continued and further enhanced in the interest of ensuring that justice is done.

Thanks to the strong presence of the multinational peacekeeping force, relative peace and security have been maintained over the past two years. Its presence has significantly helped to create a conducive environment for the implementation of the civilian aspects of the Dayton Peace Agreement. It is important, therefore, that this very significant achievement is not only maintained but further consolidated. In this respect, Malaysia believes that the further presence of an international force after the expiry of the Stabilization Force's mandate in June 1998 is necessary.

We wish to take this opportunity to commend the role played by the courageous men and women from various nations serving in the Stabilization Force and the United Nations International Police Task Force, and others who have contributed so significantly to the peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina. We would also like to offer our sincere condolences to the families of those who have sacrificed their lives for peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina, especially to the bereaved families of the 12 dedicated officers who were tragically killed in a helicopter crash last September.

Much remains to be done in respect of the reconstruction and economic-recovery programmes in Bosnia and Herzegovina. While the international community will no doubt continue to render the necessary assistance, the Bosnians themselves will have to play a major part in undertaking reconstruction and rehabilitation programmes that would generate economic activities, attract foreign investment and create job opportunities. Malaysia will continue to contribute towards the Bosnian reconstruction effort. We contributed $12.1 million in 1996, and a further $12 million has been pledged for 1997 to the reconstruction programme. Among the areas at which we are seriously looking is the development of small- and medium-scale industries. As part of our contribution for 1997, we have set aside a sum of $3 million to establish a credit fund in Sarajevo to be made available to Bosnian small- and medium-scale industries. We hope this will supplement similar schemes that are already in place in Bosnia.

At the same time, we are working closely with the Bosnians and other concerned friends of Bosnia on a project aimed at building confidence and promoting reconciliation among the Bosnians at all levels. This proposal, which was first made by the Malaysian Foreign Minister when he addressed the Assembly in September and which he made again at the Ministerial Meeting of the Organization of the Islamic Conference in October, was welcomed by the recent Peace Implementation Conference at Bonn. The proposal involves the organization of a series of workshops or forums with the participation of a number of Bosnian groups and individuals, as well as outside experts and facilitators. These workshops, or forums, are designed to provide the various parties and groups in Bosnia with a forum for dialogue and consultation to enhance awareness of the absolute indispensability of cooperating to secure peace and development, to promote inter-ethnic and interreligious harmony and to foster inter-ethnic and interfaith understanding and cooperation among the peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina. We believe that Malaysia, with its unique multi-ethnic, multilingual and multireligious background and experience in nation-building, can help make a positive contribution in this area. Since our aim is to supplement, and not to overlook, existing efforts, this project will be undertaken with support from and in cooperation with various quarters within Bosnia and Herzegovina, from other countries and from among the relevant international organizations and non-governmental organizations.

The success of all these activities aimed at establishing a lasting peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina is dependent on the full implementation of the Peace Agreement, especially its civilian component. Thus, it is important that the international community continue to manifest its commitment to this objective. However, the main responsibility for carrying out the tasks ahead lies with the Bosnian authorities. Only when the Bosnian parties themselves begin seriously to fulfil their commitment under the Peace Accords, through the effective functioning of their common State institutions, will the peace process become irreversible. At the same time, a durable peace cannot be achieved in Bosnia and Herzegovina without the full cooperation of its neighbours. It is therefore important for Bosnia's neighbours to commit themselves to the full implementation of the relevant provisions of the Dayton Peace Agreement.

Mr. Galuška (Czech Republic): Although the Czech Republic, as an associated country, endorsed the statement of the European Union presented by the representative of Luxembourg, I would like to make a few additional comments on this point. The reason is that

the situation in the former Yugoslavia, specifically in Bosnia and Herzegovina, is a long-term priority of Czech foreign policy, reflected in our intensive political, military, material and financial support for all efforts to bring stability to the region. For the same reason, we have decided to join the sponsors of the draft resolution before us. We feel it is well balanced and focused on achieving progress, which in particular is so badly needed in the implementation of the civilian aspects of the Dayton Agreement.

The Czech Republic supports a united Bosnia and Herzegovina based on the principle of single citizenship. However, it recognizes that Bosnia and Herzegovina now consists of two entities: the Muslim-Croat Federation and the Republika Srpska. We feel that the two entities and the three ethnic groups must be aware of the advantages of mutual cooperation.

We expected that the forming of a Bosnian Government and the constituent session of the Parliament of Bosnia and Herzegovina would activate common Bosnian institutions. However, the actual progress has been inadequate. We think that the major reason is the lack of political will on all sides. The internal development in Republika Srpska is characterized by a growing rift between the supporters of the two competing parties. The parliamentary elections in November, no matter how effectively they demonstrated the prevailing desire for the democratization of the society, did not mark a turning point in the effort to build an independent, united and multi-ethnic State. In this context, I would like to say that I fully agree with those who have spoken before me who appreciated the tremendous performance of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Stabilization Force (SFOR) and other personnel in organizing and supervising the elections.

It is beyond all doubt that a consistent implementation of all articles of the Dayton Agreement is crucial to the prospects for a normally functioning, democratic State capable of ensuring the basic social, legal, security and other conditions for everybody. The Czech Republic therefore fully agrees with the conclusions of the Peace Implementation Conference held at Bonn a couple of days ago, which, *inter alia*, reaffirmed that the international community must continue to work towards the implementation of the Dayton Agreement, in particular of its civilian aspects. While the military aspects of the Dayton Agreement are almost fully in place, much remains to be done for the civilian aspects, despite the recent moderate progress. The urgent problems include the return of refugees, freedom of movement and the efficiency of local police forces. A sine qua non in this context is an early understanding between the leaders of both entities on full implementation of the constitutional provisions which they have endorsed. For this reason, the Czech Republic wholeheartedly supports an extended mandate for the High Representative with a view to effective and expedited implementation of the civilian aspects of the Dayton Agreement. The Peace Implementation Conference was a clear signal that the international community wants to see concrete results and that these results will be reflected in, among other things, the volume of international aid.

The International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia has an essential role in dealing with the consequences of the war. The Czech Republic reaffirms its unfailing support for this mechanism for investigation and punishment of war crimes, which is essential to the moral renewal of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as to boosting the population's confidence in the international community.

The economic reconstruction of Bosnia and Herzegovina is a challenge to the international community. We should bear in mind that international aid should flow to all parts of the country, including the Republika Srpska. The Czech Republic has to date contributed to the international reconstruction efforts in proportion to its own capacities. It has provided development aid totalling $3 million, and additional allocations are planned for 1998.

Judging from the current developments in Bosnia and Herzegovina, one cannot abandon this country in the summer of 1998. We therefore maintain that the presence in the country of multinational armed forces led by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) must continue after the mandate of SFOR expires next June. This being the case, the Czech Republic — a country which has contributed troops to the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR), the United Nations Confidence Restoration Operation in Croatia (UNCRO), the United Nations Transitional Administration for Eastern Slavonia, Baranja and Western Sirmium (UNTAES), the Implementation Force (IFOR) and SFOR — stands ready to contribute a contingent to the new operation as soon as the appropriate political decision is made by the NATO Council and the mandate for the operation is approved by the United Nations Security Council.

Mr. Yel'chenko (Ukraine): Two years ago the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina was signed. This Agreement put an end to a senseless and fratricidal war in Bosnia and brought a real hope for durable peace in the entire region.

While entering the third year of the implementation of the Peace Agreement and the last phase of the consolidation period, we should not only review the progress that has been achieved by the parties over the last year but also look for ways to remove present challenges and prevent future ones.

The delegation of Ukraine notes with satisfaction that, due to the continuous assistance from the international community, the peace process in Bosnia has taken deep root.

Over the past year we have witnessed a number of important and praiseworthy steps made with the purpose of consolidating Bosnia and Herzegovina as a united, sovereign and politically independent State with internationally recognized borders and of maintaining its multi-ethnic and multicultural nature.

We also welcome the adoption of the political declaration by the Ministerial Meeting of the Steering Board of the Peace Implementation Council in Sintra on 30 May this year. As a member of the Council, Ukraine fully endorses the conclusions spelt out in the final document of the Bonn Peace Implementation Conference held just a few days ago.

Although the long-awaited peace has finally returned to war-torn Bosnia and notable progress in implementing the Peace Agreement can be widely observed, the causes and consequences of the war have yet to be completely removed. In this regard, my delegation shares the view that the peace Stabilization Force (SFOR) established by Security Council resolution 1088 (1996) continues to be a decisive element in securing the first results of the ongoing process of reconciliation and State-building in Bosnia, as well as contributing to the stabilization of the situation in the Balkans. A recent example of the SFOR deterrent factor might be the situation that emerged in Bosnia last summer, when the whole peace process in the broader region was seriously challenged by a deep political crisis in the Republika Srpska.

In this regard, Ukraine maintains the view that a reasonable level of international military presence is still greatly required as a stabilizing factor in Bosnia. It is also needed for further maintenance of overall European security. That is why Ukraine is in favour of a continued military presence in Bosnia and Herzegovina beyond June 1998. With this in mind, as a troop-contributing country to the former United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) and Implementation Force (IFOR) and the current SFOR operation, my country stands ready to extend its participation in a feasible post-SFOR operation to be mandated by the United Nations Security Council.

My delegation is convinced that the role of the United Nations in the process of reconciliation and civilian consolidation in Bosnia remains indispensable. At the same time, inasmuch as further success in implementing the Peace Agreement largely depends on the fulfilment of its civilian aspects, the United Nations role in the solution of the humanitarian problems should be increased. In our view, the issues of demining, economic reconstruction, human rights, return of refugees and the enforcement of law are of special importance. The proper coordination of humanitarian efforts between the United Nations bodies in the field and all the other international structures involved, including the Office of the High Representative, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the International Committee of the Red Cross, non-governmental organizations and others, as well as between SFOR and the International Police Task Force, will be extremely helpful to this end.

Demining still presents one of the serious obstacles hampering the effective implementation of the civilian aspects of the Agreement. There is no doubt that the solution of this problem will effectively contribute to the return of refugees, to increasing freedom of movement and to the economic reconstruction of the whole country. In this regard, we commend the activities of the Mine Action Centre, which, in our view, should receive more international support and adequate funding. In this context, I would also like to welcome the signing of the memorandum of understanding on the United Nations mine-action plan between the United Nations and the Council of Ministers of Bosnia and Herzegovina in October this year. This will ensure that further demining programmes that have been agreed to are properly carried out.

The final success of the peace process in Bosnia will hardly be achievable unless it is supported by effective economic reconstruction in the country with the continued assistance of the international donor community.

Top priority should be given to the projects aimed at promoting economic cooperation between the Federation and the Republika Srpska, as well as within the Federation itself. First of all, they should provide for the development of common transport and energy systems and for the construction of settlements for refugees and displaced persons. Both multi-ethnic entities and the three constituent peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina, along with all other peoples residing in the country, should equally enjoy the advantages of economic recovery, including international financial aid.

In this context, I wish to reiterate the well-known position of Ukraine on its participation in this process. We are convinced that countries, including my own, that had the most serious economic losses as a result of the sanctions regime imposed by the Security Council against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia should be assisted in getting priority access to the reconstruction projects currently under way. Such assistance would be considered partial compensation for our tremendous economic losses.

A concrete step in that direction, for instance, would be the decision by the next donor conference to introduce preferential conditions for a complex plan of cooperation between Ukraine and Bosnia and Herzegovina. According to this plan, recently adopted by the Ukrainian Government, Ukraine can provide its wide range of expertise in various fields of civil construction, energy-sector restoration and revival of agriculture.

I would also like to emphasize the importance of the establishment of an effective mechanism for overcoming the adverse consequences for countries that comply with the collective measures undertaken on behalf of the entire United Nations. Mindful of this, my delegation, under agenda item 20 (b), has put forward at this session a prospective draft resolution that has already enjoyed endorsement by a number of Member States. We hope that this draft resolution, which is to be introduced tomorrow, will be adopted by consensus and, further on, will be fully implemented.

In conclusion, let me join previous speakers who have stated that lasting peace and reconciliation in Bosnia will become a reality only with the full implementation of the Peace Agreement by the parties themselves, since it is they who bear the main responsibility for the destiny of their country.

In this vein, I should like to refer to the view recently expressed by the High Representative, Mr. Carlos Westendorp. He said that much has been done in Bosnia over the past two years, but that the efforts have to be continued. If the Peace Agreement is implemented, the country and the whole region will have a future. Should this not happen, there will be no future at all. Ukraine fully shares this opinion.

Prince Zeid Ra'ad Zeid Al-Hussein (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Allow me at the outset to express my delegation's appreciation, Sir, for your successful efforts in guiding the work of the General Assembly at its fifty-second regular session.

For two years now, Bosnia and Herzegovina has enjoyed an absence of bloodshed. As a result, certain positive developments have taken place: the mutual recognition of all successor States to the former Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia and the successful conduct of presidential and municipal elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1996 and this year, although the results of the most recent election have yet to be implemented. The authors and sponsors of the draft resolution before the Assembly have taken note of and welcomed the efforts of the States and parties concerned, and those of other international actors who have played a role in bringing about a very difficult transformation from war to peace.

Unfortunately, however, it has been a transformation from a bitter war to a bitter peace. The task of establishing common federal institutions in Bosnia and Herzegovina is still proving to be very difficult, primarily because of Pale's attitude — an attitude that is totally unacceptable. The Bosnian Serb leaders in Pale simply do not recognize the legitimacy of any institution that confirms the unitary nature of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Their behaviour at the Bonn Conference last week also demonstrates that, once again, little has changed in their uncompromising attitude towards the international community.

The Dayton Agreement will never lead to real peace until its very heart — namely, annex 7 — is implemented in full and those refugees and persons displaced from minority areas return to their original home towns. My delegation joins others in urging all the parties, especially the Bosnian Serbs, to implement annex 7 in full and in good faith.

Mr. Zacharakis (Greece), Vice-President, took the Chair.

To facilitate this, my delegation adds its voice to those of others who appeal to all parties to cooperate with the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, in accordance with Security Council Resolutions 827 (1993) of 25 May 1993 and 1022 (1995) of 22 November 1995. The accused war criminals must appear before the Tribunal in The Hague to answer the charges levelled against them. Their appalling crimes cannot under any circumstances be forgotten or forgiven by the rest of the world.

In this context, in July 1995, some 8,000 Bosnian men from Srebrenica were separated from their families by the Bosnian Serb military and subsequently disappeared. It is now widely suspected that they were executed by their captors. We can only assume this because, despite forensic and other evidence that has become available, the Bosnian Serb leadership has never offered a formal explanation for what occurred to these men from Srebrenica. If they were not massacred, where are they now? What has happened to them?

From early in the war, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan has hosted refugees from Bosnia and Herzegovina and deployed peacekeepers to Bosnia: first with the United Nations Protection Force and, presently, with the Stabilization Force and the International Police Task Force. Jordan has always been wholly committed to an independent, unitary and multiethnic Bosnia and Herzegovina. My delegation therefore finds recent media speculation over the idea of partition dangerous, highly unethical and, of course, totally unacceptable.

Mr. Kamal (Pakistan): In December 1995, the international community welcomed the conclusion of the Dayton Agreement. It was a victory for the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina as they took an historic and courageous decision for peace by abandoning the course of violence, destruction and war. The inhabitants of the war-ravaged country saw a gleam of light and hope as their leaders showed wisdom in choosing a path of reconciliation, harmony and amity. The journey ahead was fraught with obstacles, considering the deep fissures and cleavages caused to the very fabric of the society by four years of fratricidal war. An enormous amount of determination was required on the part of the leadership and the people of the multiethnic and multicultural society of Bosnia and Herzegovina to overcome these obstacles.

During the last two years, while important strides have been taken towards resurrecting the unity and territorial integrity of the State of Bosnia and Herzegovina, there continues to be deep anxiety and concern over the complete and impartial implementation of the Dayton peace agreement. The consequences of genocide and "ethnic cleansing" have yet to be undone. The vision of a united multiethnic and multicultural State of Bosnia and Herzegovina within its internationally recognized boundaries and with fully functional national institutions continues to face significant impediments.

The provisions of the Dayton Agreement are central to preserving Bosnia and Herzegovina as a united, sovereign and independent State. The Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina has throughout been forthcoming in fulfilling its obligations without any equivocation. Unfortunately, the Serbian entity has demonstrated a lack of commitment at every stage and phase of the peace process, seriously hampering international efforts.

My delegation is particularly concerned at the lack of progress in a number of areas, including the return of all refugees and displaced persons, as well as the freedom of movement across the inter-entity boundary lines. The return of refugees and displaced persons to their homes in conditions of security and honour is essential for keeping the peace process on track. This is, indeed, a critical component of the Dayton Agreement and the only way to ensure the full revival of the State of Bosnia and Herzegovina within its internationally recognized borders. We support the proposal, made by the High Representative in his recent report, that limited international reconstruction funds be made available for offering rewards to the municipalities which support the peace process and to withdraw funds from non-compliant municipalities. This is a move in the right direction.

The solemn commitment made at Dayton must be complied with to ensure proper criminal proceedings against the war criminals. If speedy justice is to be ensured, States must help in apprehending the indicted criminals. The international community must ensure the full and timely implementation of all aspects of the arrangements agreed to by the parties. The Bonn Peace Implementation Conference last week rightly pointed out the failure on the part of Republika Srpska and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to cooperate with the International Tribunal in surrendering the indicted war criminals.

It is a matter of deep disappointment for Pakistan that the ideal of peace with justice for Bosnia and Herzegovina continues to be defeated, especially by delays in the prosecution and punishment of those indicted for crimes against humanity in the territory of

the former Yugoslavia. The work of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia continues to be undermined by a chronic shortage of necessary funds and resources. Voluntary contributions essential for supporting the noble work of this Tribunal have, regrettably, not been forthcoming.

Pakistan has consistently provided moral and financial support to the Tribunal. We have so far contributed one million dollars out of the total contribution of $8.6 million received by the Tribunal. We urge all Member States to contribute generously to the Tribunal's Voluntary Fund to enable it to carry out its functions and responsibilities effectively and efficiently.

There is no doubt that the establishment of a lasting peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina depends on the effective functioning of the common State structure. The joint Bosnian State institutions should be enabled to function for the collective benefit of the Bosnian people. It is unfortunate that the work of the Presidency, the Council of Ministers and the parliamentary assembly continues to be ineffective owing to lack of cooperation from the Serb members.

The Serbs also continue to evade their obligations under the Agreement on Regional Stabilization and the Agreement on Subregional Arms Control with the clear purpose of pursing their secessionist policies. These arrangements are vital for ensuring regional stability. All States, particularly the Serbian entity, must ensure completion of declared reduction liabilities and implementation of other related obligations.

The presence of the Implementation Force (IFOR) and the Stabilization Force (SFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina has been a vital factor in ensuring relative security in the region since the signing of the Peace Agreement. We support their continued presence providing a secure environment for implementation of the civilian aspect of the peace plan. In this regard, we also welcome the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) plans to consider options for a multinational follow-on force to SFOR to support the implementation of the civilian aspect beyond June 1998.

The revival of Bosnia's economic and social infrastructure, which was destroyed by years of war, also requires priority attention and the sustained commitment of the international community. We support international efforts to rebuild Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is important that disbursement of international economic assistance to various parties be linked to their compliance with the Dayton Accord, and in particular to their commitment to the integrity and the unity of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Pakistan has extended substantial financial, technical and material support to Bosnia and Herzegovina. This is a token of our political solidarity with our Bosnian brothers. We are implementing a programme for training 200 Bosnian military personnel.

In its capacity as Chairman of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) Assistance Mobilization Group for Bosnia and Herzegovina, Pakistan is pleased to inform the Assembly that the OIC member States have continued to translate their political commitment to the unity, territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Bosnia and Herzegovina through concrete action. This has taken the shape of various forms of bilateral assistance and contributions at the international pledging conferences, as well as establishing a nexus with regional organizations and mechanisms entrusted with the implementation of the Dayton peace process.

Pakistan has consistently adopted a principled position throughout the crisis in Bosnia and Herzegovina and has extended unqualified moral and political support to the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Our support reflects our conviction that no nation should be victimized because of its smaller size and that no peoples should be brutalized because of their ethnic origin. We also believe that no nation and no people should be denied their inherent right to self-determination and their right to wage a legitimate struggle for their liberation.

We would like to take this opportunity to assure our Bosnian brethren of our fullest support in their efforts and endeavours to overcome the formidable problems that face their country and people. We are confident that Bosnia and Herzegovina will have the resilience and strength to overcome these problems. We would also urge the international community to leave no stone unturned in ensuring the realization of the dream of a sovereign, united, multi-ethnic, multicultural State of Bosnia and Herzegovina, at peace with itself and contributing to international peace and prosperity.

The draft resolution before the Assembly today embodies the principles which set forth the minimum that must be accomplished by the international community if there is to be a just and lasting peace settlement in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Pakistan is a co-sponsor of that draft

resolution and earnestly hopes that all Member States will support its adoption without a vote.

Mr. Šimonović (Croatia): Having been a delegate at the Dayton/Paris peace talks, which is the framework for our discussion today, allow me to begin by recalling the key, but sometimes forgotten or misinterpreted, elements of the Peace Agreement.

The Peace Agreement attempted to reconcile the new reality on the ground with the conflicting interests among the relevant parties in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The innovative institutional design of a new Bosnia and Herzegovina was founded on four principles: first, Bosnia and Herzegovina is a single internationally recognized State; secondly, the State is decentralized; thirdly, it is made up of two multi-ethnic entities; and fourthly, it ensures the equality of its three constituent nations.

While far from being ideal, this Dayton/Paris model was seen as the only viable solution, and in fact it still is. The problems that arise in Bosnia and Herzegovina can be attributed more or less to deviations from these four pillars of the Peace Agreement. The slow progress in building new common institutions, combined with attempts to strengthen certain old centralized institutions, is one such problem.

As one of the signatories of the Peace Agreement, Croatia is closely following its evolution. Moves towards centralization of Bosnia and Herzegovina, if pushed beyond the Dayton/Paris limits, could be destabilizing not only for Bosnia and Herzegovina, but also for its neighbours. Disregard for the existing national and local customs and way of life necessarily leads to increasing polarization, ambitions for secession and large-scale migrations.

Croatia is particularly concerned about population shifts onto its territory, not only of Croats, but also of other distressed groups that bring with them security problems and economic costs. Allow me to remind you that, over the past five years, Croatia has spent $1.1 billion for the care of Bosnian refugees, which is an enormous amount for a country our size and cannot be sustained.

My country became a signatory of the Peace Agreement as a result of the preceding Washington agreements which, through Croatia and its subsequent actions in 1995, created a balance of power in Bosnia and Herzegovina that made the Dayton/Paris accords possible. This balance of power remains crucial to peace and stability in the region.

The institutionalized relationship between Croatia and the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina is also critical to Croatia's short and long-term security needs. In the past, as we have mentioned, Croatia paid a heavy price for population shifts from Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as for terrorist and other actions originating from or tied to Bosnia and Herzegovina.

One month ago today, on 15 November, His Holiness John Paul II made an appeal to the international community to give due recognition to the plight of Croats in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Pope stressed that their desire to have their identity, way of life and equal rights protected is a legitimate one. His appeal came in view of the increasing amount of evidence about their displacement and marginalization in political life. Since the Washington agreements, the Bosnian-Herzegovene Croats have been leaving the country in substantial numbers. Those who have stayed, and a small number who have returned, have suffered from a growing number of ethnically motivated murders, terrorist acts, the destruction of private and community property, and physical offenses.

Croatia is increasingly burdened with the alienation of Croats in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Their loss of confidence in the Dayton/Paris accords and the international community in general should not be taken lightly because they happen to be the smallest of the three constituent nations. The international community often points out that the key to the reintegration of Bosnia and Herzegovina into a multi-ethnic State lies with the return of Croats to central Bosnia and Posavina. While this is undeniably true, the international community's concrete support for Bosnian Croats has not been sufficient.

We believe that the international community can take stronger steps in Bosnia and Herzegovina in this regard. One critical area for assistance is in the domain of media, where Croatian-language television and radio programmes are permitted only on the local level in the southern parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The disillusionment of the Bosnian-Herzegovene Croats is also due to the developments at the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, where, because of the lack of cooperation of two parties, and the lack of determination among others to make those parties cooperate, Croats now account for 70 percent of the imprisoned indictees. This proportion is outright unacceptable. The Bosnian-Herzegovene Croats are even more distressed by the lack of indictments against persons

who organized and committed mass murder against their communities in central Bosnia, for which there is ample evidence and documentation.

During the discussions on the text of the draft resolution before us today, my delegation had proposed a number of amendments that would reinforce some of the pillars of the Peace Agreement. One is reflected in the third preambular paragraph, in which the General Assembly reaffirms its support for equality of the three constituent nations of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The other is included in operative paragraph 7, in which the General Assembly calls for the provision of assistance to meet the infrastructural needs of the new common institutions. We are pleased that they were accepted and hope that they will add to the objective of this draft resolution — the objective of a stable and equitable Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Mr. Hashim (Brunei Darussalam): Our debate today allows us to review the overall situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Dayton peace accord has presented many opportunities and a number of challenges to the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina. As envisaged by the Dayton peace accord and as a result of actions taken by the international community through the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the onset of peace, however fragile, has allowed positive developments to take place. The task of achieving this has not been easy. We would therefore like to acknowledge the contribution of the international community, particularly NATO, in establishing the productive political climate which currently prevails in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Nevertheless, Brunei Darussalam joins others in reaffirming its belief that lasting peace and stability in Bosnia and Herzegovina can be achieved only through the full implementation of the Dayton peace accord, and we note that important aspects of the accord have yet to be fully implemented.

An understandable concern of the international community is the question of the indicted war criminals. We note that though a number of them have been brought before the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia in The Hague, many of the accused leaders still remain at large. As long as these people are not brought to justice, a lasting peace in the country will be difficult to achieve. They still have substantial influence in resisting efforts to promote further political stability in the country. We strongly support all efforts to bring these people to justice.

A further aspect of the overall situation, of course, is the problem of the proper return of refugees and displaced persons. Although a considerable number have returned to Bosnia, many of them are still homeless and have been prevented from returning to their former places of residence. We see this as being a very long and difficult task and its successful resolution as an essential part of any lasting peace in the country.

Having thus indicated some of our feelings on the item under consideration, may I say that Brunei Darussalam is glad to be able to contribute towards international efforts. We are of the view that these should be strongly complemented by similar efforts on the part of the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina, who have the final responsibility for peace, unity and development in the country.

In this regard, we hope that the international community will maintain its presence in Bosnia and Herzegovina and continue to exert its influence. Important tasks lie ahead of it if we are to see continued progress in the implementation of the Dayton Agreement, and we offer maximum support to the Bosnian people in their efforts to create a climate of confidence in a united Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Mr. Eitel (Germany): Let me express my gratitude for this welcome occasion to address the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which is of primary concern to Germany and of crucial importance for peace and stability in Europe as a whole. The needless pain and suffering that the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina, regardless of their ethnicity, have endured and are still enduring is fresh and vivid in our memory.

Let me also affirm that Germany fully supports and subscribes to the intervention that the Permanent Representative of Luxembourg, Ambassador Wolzfeld, has made on behalf of the European Union.

Only a few days ago, on 9 and 10 December 1997, Germany hosted and chaired the Bonn Peace Implementation Conference for Bosnia and Herzegovina, under the motto "Self-sustaining structures", and with the participation not only of the parties and of a very large number of other States, but also of numerous international organizations engaged in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Among these, of course, was the Secretariat of the United Nations. The Conference highlighted the degree of concern and determination with which the international community wants to see lasting

peace and reconciliation take root. Equally important was the unity with which the international community supported not only that goal, but also the means to be used to reach it.

The extensive conclusions of the Peace Implementation Conference in Bonn are more detailed and action-oriented than earlier conference results. They map out the concrete steps to be taken by the parties, with the assistance — and sometimes the insistence — of the international community, in the third year after the Peace Agreement. The 10 chapters of this document deal with all relevant aspects of the peace process: human rights, legal reform and war crimes; constitutional and legal matters; refugees and displaced persons; public order and police issues; media; elections; economic reconstruction and reform; Brčko; security and arms control; regional aspects; and the High Representative.

In addition, the conclusions put the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina into its regional perspective. They contain provisions addressing the return of refugees of Serb nationality, Eastern Slavonia and Kosovo. We shall be requesting the Secretary-General to issue the Bonn conclusions as a document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

Let me sum up the thrust of the results of the Bonn Conference in a few words: the Peace Agreement remains the blueprint for peace and reconciliation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In a great effort, the foundations have been laid and the essential structures have been built. The house of a stable and peaceful Bosnia and Herzegovina, however, can be completed only if all those living in the country — Bosniacs, Croats and Serbs — join in its construction. To this end, the international community will take an even more robust stance. The Conference has broadened the competence of the High Representative to impose decisions if the parties are unable to take them themselves.

There will be no lack of international assistance and solidarity. But assistance will be given only to those who actively engage and cooperate, and who are ready for reconciliation and a common future. Those who block and sabotage, who harbour indicted war criminals, who hinder refugees and displaced persons from returning, who incite hatred and strife, cannot expect our help. The immediate neighbours of Bosnia and Herzegovina too must assist in this endeavour. They renewed that commitment in Bonn, and they will be held to their word.

That is the message that the international community sent from the Bonn Peace Implementation Conference. I am gratified to see that this message has been picked up and strengthened in the draft resolution that is before the Assembly today. In paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/52/L.67/Rev.1, the General Assembly would welcome the conclusions of the Conference and would call upon all parties to implement them fully. I am confident that the entire United Nations community will adopt this message by consensus. I am convinced that this will not fail to make its impression on the parties, and also on the suffering people of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Mr. Frdös (Hungary) (*interpretation from French*): Hungary fully associates itself with the statement made by the Permanent Representative of Luxembourg on behalf of the European Union.

The situation that arose in Bosnia and Herzegovina presented the international community with one of its greatest challenges since the great political changes that took place in the world. The crisis in the former Yugoslavia, of which the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina was the most calamitous element, has become synonymous with the bitter disappointment and trauma that continue to haunt us today.

The Dayton peace process has yet to produce all the expected results. Now that the military provisions of the Dayton Agreement are being implemented, it is urgent to address the task of consolidating what has been achieved and of implementing the civilian side of the agreement on a priority basis. We are glad to see that peace is being consolidated in Bosnia and Herzegovina, but it also clear that the process has not yet become irreversible. The establishment of a multiethnic and multicultural Bosnia and Herzegovina requires the unconditional implementation of all the provisions of the Dayton Agreement and, in the current circumstances, a continued international military presence.

In that context, we welcome the recent Bonn Peace Implementation Conference, which highlighted the remaining tasks, such as ensuring the effective functioning of joint institutions, the strengthening of trust and cooperation among the three peoples that make up Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the importance of the administration of justice and of respect for human rights.

It is important to spend a moment on the problem of securing full cooperation with the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious

Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 and with respect to bringing war criminals to justice. We greatly regret that the fulfilment of commitments to that end — commitments based upon the Dayton Agreement — has not been viewed equally by the various ethnic communities as an unambiguous obligation. We must therefore ensure that the Tribunal has the financial resources it needs to carry out its tasks, and that it has access to all the information that is so vital for arriving at objective and balanced positions.

It is important also to mention the question of the return of refugees and displaced persons. Respect for minority rights, under international norms, is a part of this and a fundamental element of reconciliation, especially given the recent surge in ethnic intolerance throughout the country. Let me quote Ambassador Eide, Special Representative of the Secretary-General, who said in a statement on Human Rights Day that

Spoke in English.

"Diversity is richness, not a threat. It should be enjoyed, not despised".

Spoke in French.

That comment sends a very important message and should guide not only the peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina and populations throughout the former Yugoslavia, but the entire region of Central and Eastern Europe, so that there will be no repetition of the tragedies of Bosnia and Herzegovina and of Croatia.

The objective of the entire Dayton process, in spite of the efforts of those who would sabotage and undermine it, is to ensure the independence and sovereignty of Bosnia and Herzegovina in democracy and to preserve the unity and the legal and territorial integrity of that multi-ethnic country. In that context, the reconstruction and economic revival of Bosnia and Herzegovina are a sine qua non for the achievement of the objectives the international community has set itself in this country.

In the present conditions, it is obvious that this can be assured only through the continuation of international aid. That said, we share the point of view of those who make a direct link between supplying such assistance and the degree of cooperation with the international community shown by the authorities in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Thus, the consolidation of the results of the last two years depends above all on the attitude of the Bosnian parties themselves.

All those who have been following developments in Bosnia and Herzegovina know very well that the international community has made a major political investment in it. We can only reiterate the European Union's declaration that neither attempts to undermine Bosnia and Herzegovina's sovereignty nor attempts at unilateral domination over the political institutions of that country will be tolerated. Regardless of the views that any side may have regarding the events of the last few years in the former Yugoslav region, and regardless of the attitude of any side towards the methods used by the international community in dealing with this conflict — regardless of all that, it is crystal clear that there is no alternative to the preservation of the unity of the State of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the implementation of the Dayton Agreement as a whole.

Hungary, a bordering country in the region, is vitally interested in the consolidation of peace and the preservation of stability in the former Yugoslav region, and in Bosnia and Herzegovina in particular. The political, security, economic and psychological impact on the neighbouring countries, including Hungary, of the events that took place on the territory of the former Yugoslavia is well known today.

My country has reaffirmed on several occasions that it will remain ready in the future to play a role in the maintenance of peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina, with the international civilian police and within the framework of the Stabilization Force, in particular in the efforts for logistical and infrastructural reconstruction of the country. The rebuilding or the building of a number of bridges across the Sava River and the works in progress to rebuild the historic Mostar bridge, which are part of the world's cultural heritage, are also evidence of a concrete Hungarian contribution to the restoration of the country. The base of the Stabilization Force, which has been in operation for several years now in the south of Hungary, will always be available to advance the process of peace and stability in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Hungary became a sponsor of draft resolution A/52/L.67/Rev.1, which, in our view, can play a useful role in the consolidation of a peace that is still fragile in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is our hope that this draft resolution will receive the approval of our Assembly.

Mr. Çelem (Turkey): Bosnia and Herzegovina continues to focus the attention of the international community. The preservation of that country's integrity, sovereignty and political independence is a continuing responsibility undertaken by the United Nations by virtue of the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

The developments which took place in Bosnia and Herzegovina prior to the Dayton Agreement proved once again that the lack of a firm and prompt international response to aggression leads to further aggravation of crises. The Dayton/Paris Agreement therefore constituted a turning point in the unfolding of gruesome events in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1991 and 1995. The Agreement, with both military and civilian components, time and again proved to be without an alternative. Since the signing of the Peace Agreement, we have witnessed considerable progress in the military field.

However, lack of compliance on some crucial civilian aspects of the Agreement indicates that much still remains to be done. As accurately reflected most recently in the Bonn conclusions of the Peace Implementation Conference, the volatility of the situation in the region compels us to maintain a stable security environment. The Secretary-General's report of 8 September 1997 and the report of the High Representative for the Implementation of the Peace Agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina amply demonstrate that lasting peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina has not yet been established.

In this respect, I would like to reaffirm Turkey's full support for the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the annexes thereto, signed on 14 December 1995. They constitute the basis for the achievement of a durable and just peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In order to heal the wounds of the war and to attain lasting peace, security and stability in this vitally important country of Europe, it is incumbent upon the international community to exert every effort to help Bosnia and Herzegovina in its arduous endeavour for reconciliation and reintegration.

Turkey, along with other States, is actively participating in the implementation of both the military and civilian aspects of the Dayton/Paris Agreement. For its part, Turkey is ready to continue to do so.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/52/L.67/Rev.1, now before the Assembly, would like the General Assembly to reiterate its full commitment to the stabilization and consolidation of peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina and to reconciliation among its constituent peoples. We believe that it is high time for the international community to reiterate its concern about non-compliance by one party or the other on crucial aspects of the Peace Agreements and to demonstrate its willingness to take the necessary measures within its power to obtain full compliance.

For this purpose, it is essential that all the conditions envisaged by the Dayton/Paris Peace Agreement, including the return of refugees and displaced persons to their homes, be materialized without delay. While we welcome the attention given to the protection and promotion of human rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina and to the establishment of the new common institutions, in accordance with the provisions of the Peace Agreement, we regret the continuing obstruction faced by refugees and displaced persons wishing to return to their homes.

We call upon all parties, including international organizations and member States, to contribute to the creation of conditions required to facilitate their return. We are concerned that out of 2.3 million displaced persons at the end of the hostilities, only 381,000 have returned home. The remaining 1.919 million people are still either refugees or displaced persons.

We would also like to stress the importance of the work of the International Tribunal for the process of reconciliation among the constituent peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Turkey supports fully the efforts of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991, and believes that States and parties to the Peace Agreement must meet their obligations to cooperate with the Tribunal. It is also the duty of the international community to exert the necessary pressure on the parties which do not live up to their legal obligations of cooperating with the Tribunal.

In this context, we would like to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the fourth annual report of the International Tribunal, which in part states,

> "In other words, Republika Srpska is clearly and blatantly refusing to meet the obligations that it undertook when it signed the Dayton Peace Agreement, by which it solemnly undertook to cooperate with the Tribunal and, in particular, to

comply with orders issued pursuant to article 29 of the statute of the Tribunal". [A/52/375, para. 187]

The same report also portrays the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) as a party with an almost equally negative record of cooperation with the Tribunal. It is important to recall that, under the Dayton accord, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) is responsible for the Serbian entity's cooperation and compliance, as well as its own. This crucial aspect was also emphasized in the fourth annual report of the Tribunal.

As will be recalled, Security Council resolution 1088 (1996) and the Sintra Political Declaration of the Ministerial Meeting of the Steering Board of the Peace Implementation Council have established that international economic aid is conditional upon compliance with and implementation of the Peace Agreement. This very crucial principle was reiterated recently at the Peace Implementation Conference held in Bonn.

In this regard, we would like to stress the need for timely information about the level of cooperation and compliance with the Tribunal and its orders, the status of the return of the refugees and displaced persons to and within Bosnia and Herzegovina and the status of implementation of the subregional arms-control agreements, so that necessary assessments can be made.

Turkey welcomes the positive steps taken towards a normalization of relations between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and Bosnia and Herzegovina. However, there is ample room for progress in this respect. Therefore, we call upon the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) to fulfil immediately the requirement of establishing full and unconditional diplomatic relations with Bosnia and Herzegovina. We believe that such a development will eliminate another hurdle en route to normalization. Turkey also welcomes the successful conclusion of the local elections of 13 and 14 September 1997. We expect full and unequivocal implementation of the election results. Any attempt not to implement them will hamper the delicate process under way since 1995.

Economic revitalization is essential for the process of reconciliation, for the improvement of living conditions and for the maintenance of durable peace, both in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in the region. However, we are dismayed that even after the opening of the Central Bank in August of this year, issuance of common currency, implementation of common customs-tariff schedules, installation of the administrative capacity of the Council of Ministers and the adoption of the foreign-investment law are not complete. We hope that necessary steps will be taken immediately so that Bosnia and Herzegovina obtains an economic policy framework which would allow it to start taking advantage of an International Monetary Fund standby arrangement and World Bank adjustment lending.

Turkey concurs with the conclusions of the London meeting of the Peace Implementation Council in December 1996, the Sintra Declaration of the Ministerial Meeting of the Peace Implementation Council Steering Board, the special declaration on the current situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina adopted by the Organization of the Islamic Conference Contact Group and, lastly, the conclusion of the Peace Implementation Conference held in Bonn, in order to strengthen the guiding principles of the civilian consolidation plan of the peace process in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in accordance with the Peace Agreement. The outcome of those conferences shows that a more persistent approach on the part of the international community is required to achieve our declared goals.

The Implementation Force (IFOR), led by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), played a crucial role from the time it was deployed until it was reorganized as the Stabilization Force on 12 December 1996, in preserving peace and order and in ensuring progress on the rough road the peace process has been travelling on.

It is significant to note that IFOR has brought together 33 NATO and non-NATO countries in an unprecedented coalition for peace, stability and political and economic reconstruction. Although IFOR's mission has been accomplished, an international military presence is still required to provide the stability necessary for consolidating the peace. In this context, Turkey welcomed Security Council resolution 1088 (1996), which authorized the Stabilization Force (SFOR), as a legal successor of IFOR under unified command and control, in order to fulfil the role specified in annex 1-A and annex 2 of the Peace Agreement.

Turkey believes that SFOR, as a successor to IFOR, has been indispensable for the maintenance of a stable security environment essential for deterring or, if necessary, halting a resumption of hostilities. We are happy to note that currently 36 NATO and non-NATO countries participate in SFOR. We also welcome the emerging consensus on the need for a military presence

to continue beyond June 1998. Turkey, with its contributions to the United Nations International Police Task Force, is mindful of the civilian aspect of the peace process as well.

Draft resolution A/52/L.67/Rev.1, which is before the General Assembly, reaffirms the international community's support for the independence, sovereignty, legal continuity and territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina within its internationally recognized borders and calls upon those who are obstructing the peace process to fully comply with all the provisions of the Dayton/Paris Peace Agreement and its annexes. We would like to express our appreciation to the High Representative, Carlos Westendorp, and the international organizations for their unremitting efforts to establish lasting peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

At this juncture, we would like to express our grief once again for the tragic death in a helicopter crash on 17 September 1997 of 12 United Nations personnel working for peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina. We believe that we have a moral obligation to all those who have lost their lives since the beginning of the hostilities to bring our efforts to successful completion.

In conclusion, this is the most appropriate time to show that the international community is strongly committed to supporting and ensuring compliance by all parties with the provisions of the Peace Agreement and that international economic assistance is conditional upon compliance with and the implementation of the Peace Agreement. There is no doubt in our minds that the draft resolution before us will send a strong message in this direction.

Mr. Takht-Ravanchi (Islamic Republic of Iran): Today's discussions on the situation in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina give all of us in the General Assembly the opportunity to express once again our commitments to the promotion and strengthening of peace in that country. Since the signing of the Peace Agreement, the international community has witnessed both positive and negative developments in Bosnia and Herzegovina that have created both hope and anxiety for the people there.

One of the positive achievements, which can pave the way for the institutionalization of democracy in Bosnia and Herzegovina, was the recent holding of elections throughout the country on 13 and 14 September 1997 for municipal and local governments. The successful holding of the elections has demonstrated that the Bosnian people, with different ethnic and religious tendencies, can peacefully live together and deal with each other through democratic means. The international community expects full implementation of the outcome of the elections by the end of this year. The result of the elections, as was the case in the national elections in September 1996, further showed that the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina have opted for a multi-ethnic and multicultural country. Therefore, any attempt to violate and undermine the territorial integrity, national unity and independence of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina within its internationally recognized borders should be opposed categorically. We believe that all possible means to promote and strengthen the reintegration process and to establish viable and effective State institutions should be utilized.

Despite a degree of progress in the course of the implementation of certain provisions of the Peace Agreement, obstacles continue to hamper the full implementation of the Agreement as the prerequisite for peace and stability in the region.

It is a source of grave concern that the refugees and displaced persons wishing to return to their homes still face harassment and obstruction. We believe that further concrete measures should be taken so that the safe return of refugees can be accelerated, and those responsible for acts of intimidation and violence intended to discourage the voluntary return of refugees should be prosecuted. Moreover, every effort should be made to guarantee freedom of movement of people, goods, services and information throughout the country.

The Islamic Republic of Iran attaches great importance to the role of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia in bringing justice to the region. Unfortunately, despite repeated calls of the international community and in contravention of the Peace Agreement, war criminals remain free and continue to disrupt the political affairs of the county. It is our firm belief that peace and security in the region can be realized if the States and parties to the Peace Agreement endeavour to faithfully honour their obligations under the Agreement, in particular to cooperate with the Tribunal in the apprehension of indicted criminals.

The Islamic countries, including the Islamic Republic of Iran, have been at the forefront of helping their Bosnian brethren through the provision of humanitarian assistance during the war and through

participation in the rehabilitation and reconstruction programme after the signing of the Peace Agreement.

The Eighth Islamic Summit Conference, held in Tehran last week, *inter alia*, reaffirmed the commitment of the member States of the Organization of the Islamic Conference to preserve the legal continuity, unity, territorial integrity and sovereignty of the State of Bosnia and Herzegovina within its internationally recognized borders and fully supported the establishment of a sovereign, democratic, multi-ethnic and multicultural State of Bosnia and Herzegovina. It called on the Security Council to ensure the compliance by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and the Republika Srpska entity of Bosnia and Herzegovina with the orders of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. The Summit urged all countries and multilateral institutions that have pledged resources for the reconstruction of Bosnia and Herzegovina to immediately disburse the funds in order to ensure the timely completion of priority projects. The Conference also reaffirmed its support for the equip-and-train programme, which will foster long-term regional stability by creating a credible self-defence capability for the Federation. It further emphasized the importance of complying in good faith with the regional- stabilization and arms-limitation agreements.

In conclusion, we hope the General Assembly can send a unified message to all parties in Bosnia and Herzegovina that the international community is determined to support their efforts in the preservation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a civic, multi-ethnic and multicultural State and the reconstruction process of the country.

Mr. Abdel Aziz (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Egyptian delegation is pleased to join the sponsors of the draft resolution before the General Assembly under agenda item 47 on the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, not only because of the many objective provisions stated therein, but also as a reconfirmation that the continued involvement of the General Assembly in this important item reflects the importance accorded by the international community, as represented by this Assembly, to following up on the evolution of the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina and as a reaffirmation of its commitment to supporting the peace process in that State, whose people have suffered greatly during the last few years.

The consensus adoption by the General Assembly today of the draft resolution will undoubtedly reaffirm the role of the General Assembly in pursuing the implementation of the Peace Agreement in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the extent of commitment by the parties concerned in carrying out their responsibilities in accordance with that Agreement. The adoption of the draft resolution also highlights the continued role of the United Nations, which started several years ago and which is now reflected in the presence there of the civilian Mission of the international Organization to contribute to the efforts to restore peace and stability in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and in the region at large.

The implementation of the Peace Agreement in Bosnia and Herzegovina has undergone a positive development, beginning with the cessation of hostilities and ending with the successful holding of municipal elections throughout the country last September, a matter that is highlighted in the Assembly's draft resolution today.

The delegation of Egypt welcomes these developments and hopes for continued support and follow-up by the international community. In this context, we also welcome the special declaration on the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina issued in Tehran on 7 December by the recent Ministerial Meeting of the Contact Group of the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

We also welcome the conclusions of the Peace Implementation Conference held in Bonn on 9 and 10 December.

On the other hand, this clear international interest in following the implementation of the Peace Agreement in Bosnia and Herzegovina points up several issues, some of which should be stressed, and others of which should be firmly dealt with by the international community in order to guarantee the complete and successful implementation of the Peace Agreement in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Foremost among these issues is, the first, the need for a continued international military presence in Bosnia and Herzegovina beyond the expiration of the present mandate of the Stabilization Force (SFOR) next June. Developments have proved that SFOR plays a central role in bolstering the implementation of the Peace Agreement in Bosnia, including the civil aspects of these Agreements. Therefore, we welcome the conclusions of the Peace Implementation Conference held in Bonn which reflected an emerging consensus in that direction. We would like to express our appreciation to the participants in the Stabilization Force for their contribution to the Force's successful performance of its duties.

Secondly, there is a pressing need at this stage to urge all the parties to carry out their responsibilities by cooperating fully with the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and by turning over for trial all persons indicted for war crimes. Cooperation with the Tribunal represents a major part of the process of implementation of the Peace Agreement. Events have proved that the failure by the responsible authorities, particularly in the Republika Srpska, to turn over those indicted, and, their being allowed to participate in political activities pose a threat to the peace process.

The High Representative for the Implementation of the Peace Agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina, Mr. Carlos Westendorp, to whom I would like to express my sincere thanks for his efforts, has reaffirmed in his report that no tangible changes in the positions of the authorities in the Republika Srpska will be possible as long as those indicted for war crimes remain free. We wish to associate ourselves with the High Representative in that opinion. We see turning over those accused of war crimes as a basic step towards affirmation of the unity of the State and towards dealing with the issue of the return of refugees and displaced persons to their original homes.

We urge the international community not to allow extremist elements to hinder the successful and full implementation of the Peace Agreement and to take effective measures to turn in all persons indicted for war crimes at the earliest possible opportunity.

Thirdly, I would like to point out something to which we in Egypt accord great importance: the reconstruction of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the reactivation of common institutions in a manner that would assist the forces of ethnic unity. We, on our part, have upheld all our material commitments, both in the framework of the donor-States conference held in Brussels last July and in the framework of common material assistance provided by the Organization of the Islamic Conference to the people and the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

We remain ready to respond to any request made by the Bosnian authorities in that regard. In this context, we would like to highlight a point that is stressed by the draft resolution before the Assembly today, namely, that assistance from the international community remains conditional upon the degree of commitment shown by the parties to implementing their commitments in accordance with the Peace Agreement. Moreover, we hope that this will provide an impetus for all parties concerned to cooperate with a view to ensuring a better future for the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina within a State that is multi-ethnic and multicultural within a framework of full respect for Bosnia's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Mr. Türk (Slovenia): I have the honour, on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution [A/52/L.67/Rev.1], and with the aim of securing consensus on it, to propose the following few oral revisions to the draft. I will read them slowly, at dictation speed, so that all representatives can take them down.

The first revision would be to include an additional preambular paragraph, to be placed after the current seventh preambular paragraph, which appears on page 2 of the English text as the second paragraph. The text of this new paragraph would read as follows:

> "*Expressing support* for the efforts of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in facilitating the return of refugees and displaced persons throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina, and in particular the Open City project carried out by the UNHCR."

This would be the first revision, in the form of an addition.

Secondly, the subsequent preambular paragraph, which is currently the eighth preambular paragraph, would be slightly modified so that the first few words would read: "*Supporting also* the efforts ..."

This would require the deletion of the current words, "*Expressing support* for", which would be replaced by "*Supporting also*".

Finally, in operative paragraph 8, we suggest the deletion of the following words at the end of the paragraph:

> "as was confirmed in particular in the joint declaration adopted at Geneva on 14 August 1996".

These words should be deleted, so that operative paragraph 8, as revised, would read,

> "*Recognizes* that responsibility for consolidating the peace lies primarily with the authorities of Bosnia and Herzegovina;".

The remainder of current operative paragraph 8 would be deleted.

These are the revisions which I have the honour to introduce orally at this stage of consideration of this item, with the expectation that consensus on the draft resolution will be secured.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item. We shall now proceed to consider draft resolution A/52/L.67/Rev.1.

Before giving the floor to the representative of the Russian Federation in explanation of vote before the voting, may I remind delegations that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Fedotov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The approach of the Russian Federation to the draft resolution before us today, as an active participant in all stages of the Bosnian settlement, is based, first and foremost, on the extent to which its provisions correspond to the key tasks on the agenda of the peace process in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

This process must be carried out in strict compliance with the Peace Agreement and other international documents on a Bosnian settlement and must not permit a free, one-sided interpretation of the mandate of international structures, which could lead to a build-up of military might in the arsenal of the peacekeeping efforts in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

We note the work of the sponsors to reflect precisely this approach in the draft resolution in document A/52/L.67/Rev.1, as orally revised, by the representative of Slovenia. Unfortunately, however, they were unable to eliminate the biased tone of the draft resolution so that it could fully reflect the complexity and multiplicity of aspects surrounding implementation of the Dayton Agreement. Our delegation cannot agree with, for example, the excessive detail in the draft resolution on provisions regarding the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, while at the same time other serious and pressing problems involved in the settlement are disregarded and not even mentioned, including for example, restoration of the multi-ethnic status of Sarajevo.

The correction of such distorted emphasis will promote the advancement of the settlement process, as well as its stability and irreversibility. Despite our continuing reservations, the Russian delegation does not object to the adoption of this draft resolution without a vote, and is ready to support the consensus, because of the constructive attitude displayed by the co-sponsors and their readiness to take our amendments into account.

The Acting President: We have heard the only speaker in explanation of vote before the voting.

The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/52/L.67/Rev.1, as orally revised.

I should like to announce that since the introduction of the draft resolution, the following countries have become sponsors of A/52/L.67/Rev.1: Albania, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Hungary, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Liechtenstein, Senegal, Singapore and Tunisia.

May I take it that the Assembly decides to adopt draft resolution A/52/L.67/Rev.1, as orally revised?

Draft resolution A/52/L.67/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted (resolution 52/150).

Agenda item 44

The situation of democracy and human rights in Haiti

Report of the Secretary-General (A/52/687)

Draft resolution (A/52/L.65)

The Acting President: I now call on the representative of Argentina to introduce draft resolution A/52/L.65.

Mr. Petrella (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): On behalf of the group of Friends of the Secretary-General for Haiti, consisting of Canada, Chile, France, the United States of America, Venezuela and Argentina, I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/52/L.65, on the situation of democracy and human rights in Haiti.

This draft resolution, which we hope will be favourably viewed by all delegations, extends the mandate of the International Civilian Mission to Haiti of the United Nations and the Organization of American States, as requested by Haiti's President, Mr. René Préval, in his letter to the Secretary-General of 10 November 1997, and by the report of the Secretary-General (A/52/687).

The delegations of Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Finland, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the Russian Federation, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, which are sponsoring this draft, propose that the mandate of the International Civilian Mission to Haiti be extended until 31 December 1998, with the same functions that it has had to date: providing technical assistance, promoting of human rights and civic education and monitoring the human rights situation.

Three years have passed since Haiti's return to constitutional order. All the reports we have received refer to tangible progress in the field of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Nevertheless, the progress achieved to date needs to be consolidated. In particular, there is a need to concentrate efforts on the reform of the judiciary, whose operational difficulties are having a negative effect on other areas of Haitian civilian life.

Cooperation between the International Civilian Mission and the United Nations Civilian Police Mission in Haiti, created by Security Council resolution 1141 (1997), will remain essential for the fulfilment of the respective mandates of these Missions, as was cooperation with the United Nations Transition Mission in Haiti through the end of November.

On the basis of President René Préval's request and the recommendations of the Secretary-General, the countries constituting the group of Friends of the Secretary-General for Haiti call upon the Assembly to give its favourable consideration to this draft resolution, which renews the mandate of the International Civilian Mission to Haiti of the United Nations and the Organization of American States.

The definitive consolidation of Haiti's political institutions will depend upon the firm determination of its people and the wisdom of its political leaders. However, the effort of the international community remains essential in order for that will and wisdom to mature and grow strong.

Finally, the sponsors wish to express their gratitude to the Secretary-General and all of the officials of the Organization who have dealt with this delicate matter for their dedication and initiative.

Mr. Boucher (Barbados): I have the honour to speak in support of draft resolution A/52/L.65, on the situation of democracy and human rights in Haiti, on behalf of the members of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) that are Member States of the United Nations. Last June Haiti became the fourteenth such member of CARICOM.

With the termination of the mandate of the United Nations Transition Mission in Haiti on 30 November 1997, the process of democracy and reconstruction in Haiti has reached a critical stage. We believe that future progress will largely depend on the Government's growing capacity to secure a climate of domestic stability, which is essential to accelerate the country's economic and social development.

We recognize the progress made in restoring the mechanisms for the protection of the rights and freedoms of the Haitian people, so long denied. CARICOM is committed to giving its full support to these efforts. CARICOM States therefore welcome the establishment of the United Nations Civilian Police Mission, which will continue to help professionalize the Haitian National Police force and improve its ability to perform its vital function. We wish to express our deep appreciation to the members of the Security Council, to the group of Friends of Haiti and to other concerned delegations for making this outcome possible.

As we take stock of the situation in Haiti, it is useful to recall that despite its long history of independence, it was not until December 1990, following the first free elections, that the seeds of democracy took root, ending the long nightmare of military rule. The international community warmly welcomed this new beginning by the Haitian people. Little did we realize that in seven short months the dark days of dictatorship would return to engulf the country for three more years.

However, thanks to the resolve of the Haitian people and the support of the international community, the restoration of the legitimate Government in 1994 afforded Haiti a second chance to consolidate its fragile democracy. CARICOM States demonstrated their commitment to the cause by standing with the multilateral force in support of Haiti at this critical juncture, notwithstanding their meagre security resources.

We recognize that economic rehabilitation and reconstruction constitute the major tasks facing the Haitian Government and people and that significant international assistance is indispensable for sustainable development. The draft resolution before us reaffirms the

commitment of the international community to continue its assistance to Haiti.

CARICOM States share this assessment and pledge their full support to the continuing international effort. We are mindful that the Government faces a formidable challenge and that progress will be uneven. That is why CARICOM States have been insistent in urging the international community to stay the course with Haiti, given the long-term nature of the development task ahead. We know that the agents of instability and strife lurk just around the corner, ready to re-engage at the earliest opportunity.

The deterioration of economic and social conditions in the three years following the military coup in 1991 has taken a heavy toll on a country which already had the lowest development indicators in the hemisphere. The legacy of the trade embargoes, the suspension of all but humanitarian aid, the breakdown of economic and social infrastructure, the collapse of industry and the plummeting by some 30 per cent of the gross domestic product — together these present a major challenge to the reconstruction effort.

So far, the robust economic recovery envisaged following the return to democratic order and the resumption of external aid has remained elusive. Some estimates put gross-domestic-product growth in 1997 at less than 2 per cent, or just equal to the annual rate of population increase. This performance falls short of the minimum level of economic growth required to make a difference in the living conditions of the majority of the population.

CARICOM States believe that a policy to speed up economic growth must be given the highest priority, not only to bolster the democratic process but also to foster the confidence among the Haitian people that at last they will begin to share in the fruits of development which they have been denied for so long.

We therefore urge the international community, and especially the multilateral institutions, to redouble their efforts to help Haiti secure its democratic future through sustained development. We applaud the outstanding contribution of the International Civilian Mission. We recognize, however, that since external assistance will be effective only if it builds on Haiti's self-help efforts, Haiti will therefore need to do its part to create the domestic-policy environment for rapid economic growth and poverty reduction necessary to make broad-based development a reality for all its people.

Mr. Wolzfeld (Luxembourg) (*interpretation from French*): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union on the question of the situation of democracy and human rights in Haiti. The countries of Central and Eastern Europe associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia, and the associated country of Cyprus — associate themselves with this statement.

Since the re-establishment of constitutional legality in Haiti three years ago, the European Union has actively participated in the international community's efforts to create the conditions necessary for the strengthening of democracy and for ensuring full respect for human rights in that country.

For this reason, the European Union is seriously concerned by the political situation that has prevailed in Haiti for several months, as described by the Secretary-General in his report. We encourage the political parties in Haiti to cooperate in mediation efforts to find a solution to the current paralysis of public authority, which has a deleterious effect on the authority of the State at a particularly delicate stage of Haiti's development.

Elections are to be held in November 1998, and the period of time that separates us from that date is of crucial importance for the consolidation of democracy and national reconstruction. The European Union expresses its firm hope that the Haitian people will be afforded the opportunity to express themselves at that time in free, honest and transparent elections, which will be held according to rules and procedures accepted by all.

The European Union considers it imperative that comprehensive and long-term sustained assistance be provided to Haiti by the international community. Continued support, particularly by international financial institutions and other United Nations organs, is necessary in order to realize a durable and solid process that will reinforce political stability in the country.

In general, the Union is concerned by the difficult economic and social situation, by the high rate of unemployment, by the increasing cost of living and by the too-slow rhythm at which change is taking place in

the country. The European Union reaffirms its determination to continue its support to strengthening the rule of law and the economic and social development of Haiti. Thus, between October 1994 and the end of 1996 the European Community, through the European Commission, contributed ECU 310 million for that purpose. Since then, other funds have been made available, in particular through the National Indicative Programme signed in April 1997, which provides for an additional contribution of ECU 148 million. The Union has also undertaken to increase its efforts to provide aid for the juridical system and for judicial reform.

However, the European Union emphasizes that the implementation of the international assistance programmes requires active participation on the part of the authorities and their local partners.

The report of the Secretary General notes that even if the population has continued for the most part to enjoy its individual rights and fundamental liberties, the situation regarding respect for human rights remains fragile. In particular, the police forces, which are new and inexperienced, have not yet done all they should to improve their human rights record. The Union is also concerned by the persistence of violence and turmoil in the country.

The absence of a strategy and a programme for judicial reform has so far blocked the development of institutions and the real protection of human rights, and this has in turn compromised the development of police and prison institutions. The European Union expresses its hope that the new Law and Judicial Reform Preparatory Committee, whose creation it financed, will encourage the preparation of a judicial reform plan, as well as the strengthening of institutions in this sector.

The International Civilian Mission to Haiti (MICIVIH) is called upon to play an essential role to strengthen the democratic institutions in Haiti by monitoring the respect of human rights by the security forces, by providing technical assistance to the operations of the police forces and the judicial personnel, and by supporting the development of a programme to promote and protect human rights. These activities are essential for the restoration of a climate of freedom and tolerance, which is necessary for the consolidation of democracy and justice in Haiti in the long term.

In a related field, the Union welcomes the adoption of Security Council resolution 1141 (1997), which established, for the duration of one year, the United Nations Civilian Police Mission in Haiti, whose assignment will be to help the Haitian Government by providing it with support and assistance for the professionalization of the Haitian National Police.

The European Union supports the recommendation of the Secretary-General, contained in the draft resolution before us, to prolong the mandate of the United Nations component of the International Civilian Mission to Haiti (MICIVIH) until 31 December 1998. The 15 member States of the European Union have also co-sponsored this draft resolution.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item for this meeting. We shall hear the remaining speakers this afternoon, after the General Assembly has considered the reports of the Sixth Committee.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.